

Citadels of Chaos

By

Cornelius Carl Veith

Boston: Meador Publishing Company

1949

This book is dedicated to the memory of Jefferson Jackson, Lincoln, and those venerable Americans who opposed economic slavery and foreign domination, and who taught that the Government should use Constitutional money for the common welfare of all Americans. It is dedicated to their followers who oppose today's economic slavery (boom-bust economy and State Socialism) and who oppose foreign domination (America-Last [groups] ... giving America away) as well as to those who believe that their servants in the nation's Capitol should support the Constitution in its entirety—including that section which gives to Congress the power to issue money and regulate its value.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter I: In General	2
Chapter II: Dove of Peace and Pigeon of War.....	23
Chapter III: Political Independence, Financial Bondage.....	36
Chapter IV: Bonds and Bondage	55
Chapter V: Next Act, Same Plot, Same Characters.....	74
Chapter VI: More Worlds to Conquer	101
Chapter VII: Big Berthas and the Big Four.....	122
Chapter VIII: Round Two	152
Chapter IX: War Pays Off	181

Introduction

How would you like to be in the dry goods business when the length of a yard would be subject to constant change, containing thirty inches one day and forty inches the next day?

How would you like to be in the grocery business when the weight of a pound would vary from time to time, containing fifteen ounces one time and twenty ounces the next?

How would you like to be in the gasoline business when the volume of a gallon would contract and expand at unpredictable times?

Or how would you enjoy being a farmer when the bushel would contain three pecks today and five pecks tomorrow?

And what if the changes would never be known in advance and were ordered by someone not in the least concerned with your prosperity or failure?

Every reader of this book is in such a business because the one essential by which his or her prosperity or failure is measured – the dollar – is constantly changing in value. These changes are not known in advance and are directed by individuals for their own unsocial advantages with no concern for the fate of millions of individual citizens of which the nation and the world is made.

The Citadels of high finance direct the devious wanderings of the one object which by its very nature must be stable and dependable if chaos is to be averted. Even the periods of comparative prosperity contain the germs of chaos because the prosperous in the act of paying off their debts actually cancel money out of existence.

The citadels of old were often established on inaccessible heights and by their guns were virtually impregnable. But none were ever more so than the Citadels of present world Chaos. They are firmly established. Their guns of propaganda and deceit render them almost immune. Though their inhabitants are called “Economic Royalists” by the great Indispensable One and “Gluttons of Privilege” by his carbon copy successor, they remain secure. However, the history of citadels as well as of nations teaches that mankind is not powerless to destroy what man has built.

In these pages the location, plans and operations of high finance are exposed. The author dares to hope that this important knowledge will hasten and make more certain the necessity of their capture by men in the forces of Constitutional Government.

Chapter I

In General

“Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws.”

That was Meyer Amschel Rothschild, father of international banking, talking. That he knew the power of money is evident not only in the control he exercised over national affairs of his own generation, but especially in the evolution of world enslavement by which private individuals with private corporations now usurp for private fortunes the supreme prerogative of any nation—the right to coin and issue its own money for the common good and national welfare.

Under this oppression the world asks: What is wrong with the organization of humanity, especially its Western Sector, America? Why were there two wars within one generation and ominous threats of a third when no one wants to bleed and die in battle? Why destroy one tyrant only to create another even more ruthless? Why do national leaders vehemently reiterate a policy of peace while rapidly plunging us into war? Why is it that the richer a nation becomes the further it sinks into debt? Why is it that nations are existing only because of a bankers overdraft? Why is it that the American state department becomes in effect a branch of the British Foreign Office? Why is it that America, who started out to set everything right in the world, is ending up by losing her own birthright?

The secrets of the great financial conspiracy furnish the answers to most of the perplexing problems of today. Americans have been asked to seek a solution in almost every conceivable extraneous consideration. They are now asked to consider the conspiracy of money. Knowledge of its aims, its methods and its results will simplify much.

Thoughtful individuals are beginning to realize that world wars were not fought because there happened to be one or two bad men in Europe. Sincere inquiry into the truth is causing many to realize that it was not so much a question of bad men as it was a question of bad money. How this force has reached the extent of making a cat's-paw of mighty Mars is now laid bare page by page with the prayerful hope that the light of Knowledge and the power of Truth will become sufficiently strong to destroy the tyrant of international finance and to the establishment of a sound genuinely American system of society.

Informed Americans whose intelligence has been insulted, whose property has been confiscated, whose independence has been outraged, whose pockets have been picked, whose loved ones have been killed will then turn to the very foundation of their government and for the first time will enforce Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the Constitution, namely:

"Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof; and of foreign coin."

This unprecedented procedure would insure more stability, liberty and plenty than the UN, the World Court, Bretton Woods and all the other monstrous, farcical smoke-screening Utopias of a World Super-government ever promised to do. It is not maintained that a constitutional money system would automatically cure every economic ill it is possible for the human intellect to conjure up, but it is a certainty that this is the basis upon which other reforms must be built. Only with monetary reform can there be any other economic, political or social reform. It is simply a case of putting first things first: of reaching into the cause of the causes.

It is useless, for example, to talk of an adequate wage or a living wage when the costs of living are constantly and unpredictably fluctuating because of the voluntary contraction and expansion of credit at the whims of the all-powerful bankers. It is useless to talk of peace because there will be world wars so long as these bankers continue to draw interest on increased national debts which follow war, and so long as these bankers with their foreign brothers need the combined strength of weaker nations (made weaker basically because of their vicious policies) to overcome a more powerful nation which became powerful through a financial system operating for the common good of the nation instead of the individual good of a select few....

A convert from the disastrous international banking system to the cause of sound money, Robert H. Hemphill, former Credit Manager of the Federal Reserve Bank (U. S. branch of the international banking set-up) of Atlanta, Georgia, said:

"Money is the most important subject intellectual persons can investigate and reflect upon. It is so important that our present civilization may collapse unless it is widely understood and its defects remedied very soon."

Death prevented a complete expose and confession of a former Governor of the Bank of England (English branch of the international set-up), V. C. Vickers. In his uncompleted book, "Economic Tribulation," he wrote among other things:

"This national and mainly international dictatorship of money which plays off one country against another . . . cannot be permitted for much longer to render Democratic Government a mere nick-name."

Many great men of Europe and America, including our founding fathers, our first three presidents, our foremost scientists and inventors, will be quoted to demonstrate the views of intellectual men on the evils of our present monetary system and the necessity of found-

ing it on the Constitutional provision. Unfortunately their wisdom on the subject of money is all but unknown because the Money Trust largely controls the media of propaganda. When an individual, no matter how famous or patriotic, ventures to present the facts on this all-important topic, the Smear and Suppress Troopers show their might.

The Great Commoner, William Jennings Bryan, knew of this practice by the Power ... who prey upon the nation in time of peace and conspire against it in time of war. His words on this point are as true now as they ever were.

"It (the Money Power more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than bureaucracy) denounces as public enemies all who question its methods or throw light on its crimes."

...When Charles Lindbergh, Sr., father of the *Lone Eagle* and former congressman, charged political and financial interests were leading us into war (World War I) his meetings were broken up, his patriotism attacked and the plates of his book were destroyed by government agents. In his book, "Your Country at War," the elder Lindbergh wrote:

"We have not only been deceived but we have been charged and made to pay the whole cost of maintaining the (monetary) system with which they have done the deceiving.... No one with an ounce of brains unless filled with injustice, or a mere hireling, will defend such a practice."

Arthur Kitson, brilliant financial writer, engineer, inventor with nearly five hundred patents to his name, introducer of the talking film and pioneer in the present Technicolor development, first decided to expose this racket when a bank manager showed him instructions from banks in New York which urged the little banks to withhold money from the people, to explain that this scarcity was caused by the Sherman Bill, and to get the public to write Congress in opposition to it. Naturally the people wrote, the Sherman Bill was repealed and the banks got what they wanted – the control of currency. Kitson wrote "The Bankers Conspiracy." When the contents reached the ears of the money internationalists all copies were suddenly bought up and taken from circulation. The book's plates were destroyed to prevent reprinting....

Not only a few great minds, but also many common people, could read the signs of the times. The author recalls the evening he was pondering some statistics and discovered that German exports in 1937 surpassed those of Great Britain for the first time since World War I. He looked across the room to his father and said confidently, "That means another world war in about five years." After a moment's reflection he added: "If the financial rulers of the British Empire wait ten years Germany will break her up without firing a shot. They won't let Germany get that powerful."

The author was no “official spokesman,” “outstanding authority,” “technical adviser,” or “expert on foreign affairs.” He was just a piece of ordinary cannon fodder. Other such bits of cannon fodder knew what was coming before England, after sending frenzied cables to President Roosevelt, backed up Poland against Hitler when everyone knew England had no love for the Poles and cared less for their fate, as later events proved. She did not and will not send as much as a single soldier to fight for Polish liberation.

Ordinary potential casualties deduced many things from simple observation. They knew who would fight the war and who would profit from it by reading items telling of Europe’s powerful families sending their fortunes in idle jewelry to this country for safe-keeping and other items about poor English housewives being asked to give up their essential pots and pans in scrap drives. They knew when reading one day of the Allies fining Germany one billion dollars in reparations and the next day of the United States giving Britain four billion dollars (including the cancelling of an under-estimated twenty-nine billion dollars in lend-lease at two cents on the dollar) that rich America, a beloved and victorious ally, would be hit harder than the hated and defeated enemy, even though her national debt is larger than all the rest of the allies put together. They knew such a course had become an accepted practice but they did not know this policy was adopted because it was to the exclusive advantage of the international banker.

If some modern Rip Van Winkle sleeping through the war were to arise today he would believe Hitler won the conflict. All the evils predicted in the event of defeat are rampant. There is less peace in Europe than before the war. There is less Democracy, less freedom of speech, less freedom of religion, less freedom from want, less freedom from fear, more suffering, torture, oppression and crime than there was in 1939. Even the Government of the United States, the last refuge of hope to a suffering world, is in far greater danger of collapse than it was when Hitler was kicking the British into the sea at Dunkirk. This, too, the potential casualties could have predicted. It was a proven fact that modern wars offered no solution to the problems which perplex the brotherhood of nations. The Kellogg Peace Pact outlawing war was a farce in view of the numerous “undeclared wars” which followed. America’s Allies repudiated their debts and only the bondholders profited on the orgies of destruction. Many had the logic to reason that since only the financiers profited by war it must be they who want wars. They have noticed that no war has ever been left unfought because there was a lack of money with which to fight it. During the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln showed his understanding of the power of money, and the fears he had then are as evident and all the more to be feared by Americans now because of the increased power of the money men. Lincoln said:

"As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until wealth is aggregated in the hands of a few and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of the war."

Much is known of the secret instruments and dealings of the international financier. Much more is known in its effects if not on how they were brought about. For example, in 1933 Congress gave the power and privilege to President Roosevelt for having three billion dollars of money printed for use in necessary transactions to salvage the sinking trend of the Union—the so-called Stabilization Fund. The President started to turn out this debt free government money, but suddenly and mysteriously he called it all off. He shut down the presses, turned right around and continued the old method of giving (and we do mean giving) bonds on which the banks collect interest. That much is known: just how it was brought about is not known. No explanation was ever given. It is a matter which needs a Congressional investigation. It would be interesting and informative to see a report of the secret plottings and conferences which shut down the presses.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, despite his early pledges to *"drive the money changers from the temple,"* in reality gave the temple over to them for the privilege of a servant's job with room and board. He railed and ranted against the "economic royalists," yet every legislative act he backed, from the Gold Act of 1933 to Bretton Woods of 1945, made these self-same powers even more powerful. He was elected on a program of economy and immediately launched upon the greatest orgy of squandermania the history of the world has ever seen even before the necessity of the "war effort" and the establishment of the four freedoms "everywhere in the world." These unbiased observations are a true indication of the degree to which he was the master of his own policies. It demonstrates again the terrible truth of the Rothschild philosophy among international financiers; they care not who sits in the president's chair or in Congress as long as they issue and control the money of the nation.

Senator Elmer Thomas, addressing a meeting of 500 financiers of New York City, February 6, 1933, said:

"Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen of New York.... Notwithstanding the plain mandates of the Constitution, as a rule financial policies do not originate in Congress. As a rule they do not originate in Washington . . . the financial policies of America originate right here in this great city. The New York Federal Reserve bank is the head and heart dominating and controlling the financial policies of our Government.... Working and cooperating with this financial institution are the great banks of New York City

...The heads of those powerful banks . . . have, as a general proposition, Washington and the Congress as their agents. Today the Government at Washington is only one of the clients of this unified and powerful aggregation. A nod and a whisper by the powers mentioned can turn the tide, can reverse the process of deflation and depression. ...The people forming the cities, counties, States and even the Federal Government are bankrupt and prostrate.... Bankers of New York, I plead with you to face the facts, meet the issue, and PERMIT the people and Nation to live."

Speaking in the Senate on February 22, 1933, the Senator said:

"Any time Wall Street wants a Bill passed, they send a suggestion down to Washington, and we are kept here sometimes until midnight to pass the Bill. But if Wall Street is opposed to legislation in Congress, it cannot be gotten out of Committee, and it cannot be gotten before the Senate for consideration, and it has no chance of passing."

Those who argue that Roosevelt alone took us into the late war are wrong. Politics and politicians are effects, not causes; they are directed by other powers which are the causes. These powers have the habit of being spelled "M-o-n-e-y M-a-n-i-p-u-l-a-t-o-r-s."

If Roosevelt was so easily controlled by the bankers and their interests how does it happen that they supported his Republican opponents? That is a good question, but it is easy to answer. In tracing the recent history of political parties it will be found that since the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act the money interests dominated both political parties, and controlling both, they could be expected to contribute to both. And they did contribute to both: Politically, they are Republicrats—or Demopublicans.

In 1934 four hundred "economic royalists" contributed to Roosevelt's campaign with several chipping in to the tune of fifty thousand dollars or more. That they gave to such an extent might have been due to the evidence that F.D.R. could be controlled while his opponents had not yet so extensively demonstrated this submissive quality. Or the reason might have been partly due to Roosevelt's magnetic personality which gave influence to his speeches (if they can be called his when written almost exclusively by Raymond Moley, Tommy Cochran and Ben Cohen) and even though he frequently oversimiled his points he had the following to put across the directives of the Hidden Power.

This Hidden Power is a world power which, through its permitted control of national money supplies, has plunged every dominated nation into the miseries of irretrievable debt and the world into economic and military strife. This force cannot be underestimated or neglected if the worthy "hope which beats eternal in the human breast" are to be realized. Ne-

glect and indifference must give to action based on Knowledge and Truth. Economic conditions of the present concern the masses more than all else, yet receive the least attention.

The bankers, their subsidized Americans and a group of hyphenated hybrids who would substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes say the question of debt and finance are far beyond the average man's powers of comprehension. In debating the four billion dollar loan to Britain Senators Barkley and McFarland, swallowing this bunk, agreed that *"this whole question involves so many economic problems it is difficult for any human being to understand them."*

Time-serving politicians and professors say that in dealing with these subjects the people are dabbling with the laws of Economics while fundamentally all the nation's ills are really due to the war, or over-production, or Joe Stalin's aggression, or conservative Republicans, or Leftist Democrats or some other convenient evasion. The wise businessman says people simply choose the wrong professions, and might add to his premise by suggesting a few rackets and immoral schemes of oppression which brought him success. The clergy often say these affairs are entirely outside the Church's sphere, that members of the clergy are concerned with spiritual affairs and the religious life of their flocks. With these "explanations" the people sit like a man in blissful ignorance, enjoying a leisurely smoke while sitting on the proverbial powder keg.

John Adams wrote to Thomas Jefferson words which are as true in 1949 as they were in 1787:

"All the perplexities, confusion and distress in America arise, not from defects in their Constitution or Confederation, not from want of honor or virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation."

In all truth and fairness the science of money is much more simple than some of the other sciences taught in grade and high schools; it is no more complicated than yesterday's baseball box score. The elements of monetary theory had been perfectly understood since the time of the ancient Greeks. Not until the eighteenth century did the educational system deliberately impose upon men's minds confusion and neglect of the ABC's of these problems.

The plain fact is America is not now a free nation. Like individuals, nations in debt are not free. They are the slaves of the Hidden Power of money makers who are in the business of money making for making money. The people pay with their lives, liberty, and every other noble, God-given gift the tribute their masters exact. Horace Greeley once wrote most appropriately:

"While boasting of our noble deeds we are careful to conceal the ugly fact that by our iniquitous money system we have nationalized a system of oppression, which, the more refined, is not less cruel than the old system of chattel slavery."

On the same theme Woodrow Wilson said in 1916:

"A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We have come to be the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated Governments in the civilized world—no longer a Government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of small groups of dominant men."

Senator Barkley once confessed on the Senate floor:

"We have no power over money. We cannot pass a law here to conscript it in time of peace, at least, though I favor a law that will put all Americans on the same equal basis in time of war with respect to their lives and property. But we have no power to conscript money . . ."

How far down the road to corruption national policy has gone is tragically expressed in this statement by Barkley—then Majority Leader of the Senate—when he says we have no power over money. What a confession for a Senator now Vice President—when he says we have no power over money. What a confession for a Senator who has sworn to support the Constitution which says as explicitly as human language can, that Congress has the power to coin and issue money!

The international aspect of this selfish rule, together with charges of the Federal Reserve Banking System being simply the American branch, that it operates in violation of the clear and concise language of our Constitution, that it is the principle cause of strife and wars, and all other points mentioned in this chapter, will become clear as the story unfolds in the course of "Citadels of Chaos."

Only today came a report that indicates the international completion of this domination. Canada now forbids Americans to go from one point in Alaska to Canada, on the Alaskan highway built with American money, or to pass through Canada over the same highway from the Alaskan seaport of Haines to the Alaskan capital of Fairbanks. In this hemisphere where the border relations of Canada and America have been the marvel of the world for more than a century, where the best of relationships prevail, there comes an evil rampant in Europe to the detriment of all concerned. And why? Because the highway

started at Haines threatens to take traffic from a parallel railway running from Shagway to Whitehorse in the Yukon which is owned by London financial interests.

Another indication is seen in the official visit of the arrogant and offensive British Field Marshal Montgomery to Washington to "*establish a fraternalship among the English speaking peoples.*" In other words the money monopolists are hard pressed to preserve a rotten Empire and might need for their purpose a few more American armies for incompetent British officers to mix-direct. America, Britain and France are intertwined in a triple alliance of finance, an accord never ratified by the people of the United States or their Congress. Yet the pact was and is as binding as any military alliance has ever been. In fact, because of the power finance wields, this alliance precludes the inclusion of a military pact. Because Russia, one of the so-called Big Four, is not in the financial alliance there is much talk of war with her.

If anyone dares suggest an American monetary system for Americans he is told that such a course is useless unless the rest of the world agrees to do the same. The simple fact is that money is primarily national, not international debt. It is worthless in any other country until exchanged for that nation's money. In practice it is not exchanged into it, but exchanged for it. Not all the propaganda scares can be investigated in these pages. It is invaluable to learn, however, that there are propaganda scares which attempt to hide the fact that they are the ones who are scared-scared that an honest, efficient money system will make America invulnerable to foreign profiteers with their economic spasms and to foreign prophets with their political "isms." For their own selfish gains they fear the day when America will exist on something besides an over-draft from private bankers.

A circular dated September 19, 1946, was headed: "*Federal Reserve Bank of New York.*" The caption under this heading read: "*Fiscal Agent of the United States.*" Who was ever taught in school or elsewhere any principle of provision of the Constitution by which a private corporation could be conceived as the fiscal agent for this land of millions of free people, the United States of America?

These are the days when "experts" sweat at their desks figuring out the explanation of the next depression.... But all will be heard in the press and over the radio when and after the next bust strikes, because they are a vital link in the chain of deception, lies, confusions and smoke screens needed to cover up the truth about all booms, depressions and busts—to cover up the fact that they are manmade, planned, controlled and timed to fit the financial interests of their creators. The 1920 bust, as will be seen, was made at a secret, conspiratorial meeting of the Federal Reserve officials and class A bankers, held in the Treasury Building in Washington, D. C., May 18, 1920. But the "experts" still prate about the causes of this panic. They blame Labor, Farmers, Communists, Fascists, spendthrifts, hoarders, sun spots, and even Almighty God Himself.

President Truman meets with his Cabinet, composed largely of Wall Street men, to talk in secret about high price so the press reports. That is a sign of depression as surely as a bluebird's call in March is the sign of Spring. They are planning now on how to meet it when the money men name the day, a day that might already be set by the financiers in their secret meetings.

The sole function of money is the exchange of wealth and a measuring unit of value. Money itself is not wealth. Wealth satisfies human wants; money is the means of exchanging this wealth, It is a medium used to avoid the old barter system of direct exchange of goods. It makes easy the interchanging of goods and services, so that when a person parts with anything having value without desiring anything in return he can keep money as a receipt for wealth surrendered. It is an evidence that he has contributed some goods or services which society wants, and is a demand on society for an equal value of other goods or services which he may employ as he so desires.

In the present system Frederick Soddy has graphically defined money as "*the nothing of which you must have something before you can get anything.*" By saying money is "*the nothing*" he refers to the manner in which ninety-five percent of it is created. When a person makes a loan of a thousand dollars, for example, the bank does not give him a thousand dollars in cash. It credits him on its books with a thousand dollars against which the person may write a thousand dollars worth of checks. There is a thousand dollars of neither gold, silver, tin, wood or paper. It was created by a flourish of the pen. The bank's books now credit this loan under deposits yet there was not as much as a penny deposited with them. Theirs is purely an ink-pot kingdom.

Marian Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, testifying before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, June 24, 1941, admitted that money is "*created out of the right to issue credit money.*" To say that you must have some of this nothing before you can get anything is the painful daily experience of most people. The fact that the borrower of this thousand dollars signed a mortgage over to the bank does not make the book entry money; it indicates what is back of their "nothing."

When the borrower pays this thousand back, that amount is stricken from the bank's deposits. A person in effect destroys money by paying it back. Marian Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, testifying September 30, 1940, on the Price Control Bill said:

"If there were no debts in our money system, there would be no money."

Professor Irving Fisher, outstanding monetary authority in America, wrote:

"If all the loans were paid, there wouldn't be a dollar in circulation."

A former Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Georgia, Robert H. Hemphill, said:

"If all bank loans were paid, no one would have a bank deposit and there would not be a dollar of currency or coin in circulation. This is a staggering thought."

Henry Ford in "The Dearborn Independent" rightly said:

"The one aim of these financiers is world control by the creation of inextinguishable debts! And since gold is a metal which neither laws nor inventions can increase, the supplies of which Nature has so far limited, control has become a very simple achievement. The irony of the situation is in remembering that this instrument of slavery was the creation of a British statesman on the advice of a British banker."

The fact that money which is the necessary medium for payment of debts itself comes into existence as a result of a debt is evident in the very nature of the present banking system. This is easily discovered even without the unimpeachable word of top-ranking authorities. And it follows as a logical consequence that since money comes into existence as a result of a debt to the banks, the cancelling of these debts automatically cancels the existence of money.

When depressions strike, people often ask: "Where did the money go? It didn't just vanish into the air!" The plain truth is: That is just exactly where it did vanish—into the thin, very thin air by simply being stricken from the books—thereby making a reality out of one's wildest imagination.

These debts which create deposits are created out of nothing more formidable than an ink pot at the selfish personal whim of private bankers.

The late Lord Keynes, international monetary authority, a big profiteer in the crash of 1929, Great Britain's gift to the New Deal, and master mind of the World Bank, admitted:

"There can be no doubt that all deposits are created by the bank."

R. G. Hawtrey, once a high official of the British Treasury, said:

"When a bank lends, it creates money out of nothing."

(Quoting British officials to prove a point on the Federal Reserve Bank policy might seem to some as being irrelevant and immaterial, but unfortunately that is not the case. It will be seen in the following pages how the British system was secretly and reasonably inflicted upon the United States....)

Theoretically, if the victim borrowing the thousand dollars demanded cash for that amount he could get it—if too many other people didn't do the same thing. Thus the bank, while placing this loan under deposits on its books, although not one red cent was deposited, actually owes the borrower that amount in real currency. A banker is the only man in the world who draws money from his debts. He is, under the present system, essentially a leech on society. Money is to the nation's economy what blood is to the human body. It has truly been called the economic blood of the country....

It is high time the banking profession go into the banking business instead of the business of creating and destroying money. It is also time the banking profession be cleansed and started on the worthy pursuit of constructive commercial habits.

Many bankers are our personal friends whom we know to be honest in intent. The rules of their game have become so universal and accepted they no longer see the immorality with which it is rife. Bankers are more ignorant of the inner workings of their profession than any other professional group. If it is a question concerning the general over-all policy of finance it is generally useless to ask a financier. (Some attempt to distinguish between a banker and a financier. The difference is one of degree, not of kind.) Generally they are the innocent cogs of a destructive machine and would welcome a sound and honest means of earning a modest livelihood.

The little banks are in the same boat as the average American. Ten thousand of them closed during the last panic and ten thousand more will likely close if the Federal Reserve Bank decides on another panic. They have to use the Federal Reserve Bank if they do business, and they have to buy a certain amount of stock. They are needed for political purposes but they do not participate in the management of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Since the banker draws interest on this curious and dubious money, the more debts, the more interest. The more wealth a nation has the more debt the banks can force. Hence the more wealthy a nation is the more it goes into debt. The more it goes into debt the greater are the profits to the banking system. The Federal Reserve System is a mathematical impossibility. It was illogically constructed and predestined to failure and will eventually crush the Government of the United States under a burden of debt. This system supports the nation like a rope supports the hanged.

America's is a Boom-Bust Economy. A man prospers in a business boom, pays off his debt and thereby cancels money which helps bring on a bust. Or the banks lend out their credit to the extent of practicality and thus inflate a boom. When the limits of their inflation (and that is the real inflation which is so dangerous to the nation) has been reached they begin to contract their loans thereby bringing on a bust. These busts are not brought on because mankind suddenly decided to abolish the habit of eating three meals a day. Nor because termites overnight consumed all the gold in the world. Nor because all the crops of

the nation were wiped out in one momentary blast. Certainly not because we are obligated to feed Europe. Yet people are evidently supposed to believe these or some other fantasy to be the cause. They must learn that the cause is their ... ruinous system of finance.

The remarkable little newspaper, *Money*, edited and published by John Scott in Craryville, N. Y., has some interesting material on the great evil of our money system — its interest rates. Interest rates are those little steals which take money from the hands of the producer and deliver it into the hands of the non-producer. By their injustices progress and production are halted as industry suffers the loss of her profits and the laborer is deprived of his wages. It is from these rates that an accepted formula for the expansion and contraction of business is forecasted. An interpretation of future market trends is thereby formulated for the profitable buying and selling of securities in Wall Street.

While Wall Street deals with the abuses of the interest rates, the real deception has its origin with a privileged group of the Federal Reserve Banking fraternity illegally authorized to deal in usury. The economic unsoundness of this aspect of the money system has developed a very much unbalanced budget for which an unprecedented high rate of taxes must be collected. For this, business and labor are forced to give up the better part of their profits while under an OPA law they fought each other for higher prices and higher wages.

Unfortunately management and labor do not object to being left to the mercy of a privately owned banking bureaucracy. Recent increases of these rising rates will have a disastrous effect on progress and production. Yet management and labor remain serene. Their arguments, pro and con, are for higher prices or higher wages. Today paradise is gained with a boom; tomorrow, lost in a crash.

America's economic history has been stigmatized with the eventualities of the upward-downward spirals of boom and bust. Although she has, and has always had, a super-abundance of wealth for a lasting prosperity, and even though management and labor plan in hopes of sustained prosperity, she shall struggle in vain for this goal as long as the tools of Government for the expansion and contraction of money and credit are used as a means of usurious exploitation for the benefit of a privileged few.

At one time there was a difference between capitalism and "financialism" but today a distinction, if there is one at all, is academic rather than practical. The financial group has absorbed or obtained so much control over the owners of industry that there exists a purely financial economy today.

Formerly a capitalist owned and managed the tools of production and he was a producer, not a money lender. If this country had sound banking and tax laws the ownership of her factories and industrial machinery would be in the hands of those who own and direct their operation. She would have a free and private enterprise system instead of a corporate, absentee owner, financial system.

Capitalism today has become financial in meaning, effect and practice. It no longer refers to the private ownership of the tools of production but refers to the financial ownership and control of the tools of production.

It is an openly hostile element that is shouting, "*Down with Capitalism.*" The worst of this element claim that science and invention necessitate discarding Capitalism and the adoption of a Socialistic form of government. Their aim is to further entrench the wealth and power of these internationalists. The right of Capitalism, or the right to ownership of private property, has not failed and never will fail. The error lies in the abuses of Capitalism, in allowing a small minority through the malicious operation of the money system to destroy the economic security and peace of the world.

America, the land of limitless resources and learning, has grown rapidly. As human civilization continued to push forward into the face of the setting sun, numerous ports along the Atlantic sea coast became centers of growing commerce. Soon spinning wheels left the homes and factories arose. Carpenters and masons specialized in their jobs. The West was converted into agricultural pursuits. Banks came to be the heart through which the life blood of the nation circulated....

Then the banks which gave rise to increasing progress again came to regulate progress for their own private benefit. In the hands of the government the money system would have operated for the good of the government in all its component parts, the individuals. But in the hands of a few private men it was naturally operated for the benefit of a few private men. Then came rugged individualism for the few and ragged individualism for the many. The words of Lucan again stood unimpeached: "*The human race lives for a few.*"

World War I submarined world trade, shot international confidence, blasted prosperity and poisoned people's government. The Armistice marked the temporary end of military strife and the beginning of a world war against the previous social and economic conditions. After the "War for Democracy" came the treaty of peace which brought neither peace nor Democracy. It did not bring Democracy for the governments of the world were one by one formed into the ranks of dictatorship of one form or another. It did not bring peace for never were there more wars springing up here and there, and when the larger one came never were nations more willing and ready to meet it.

The revolt against the old social and economic conditions is universal. It is a war against Capitalism which was, before World War I, in the course of universal development, and has greatly increased in vigor after the outbreak of the second world conflict. As each country is studied, it will be discovered that although the recent developments spring from a common cause—revolt against Capitalism, or rather, against the abuses of Capitalism—the different form which it has assumed in Communism, Fascism, Nazism, Socialism, are but the results of the various conditions in which it found the various countries.

Lenin knew there would be wars as long as flagrant abuses of Capitalism remained. For his own purposes he failed to distinguish between Capitalism and its abuses but predicted:

"Imperialist wars will never cease as long as capitalism remains capitalism. As long as capitalism remains capitalism, surplus capital will never be used inside the country to raise the standard of living of the people. It will always be sent abroad to increase the dividends of the money lenders."

Global loans to anybody and everybody who gets a Communist bellyache is in direct fulfillment of this observation.

From the days of Rothschild and Waterloo International Bankers have shifted their gold from land to land, financing first in one country, then another, inciting an endless series of wars and revolutions. In 1812 they financed England in her wars against America and France. In 1848 their money spread revolution throughout Europe. In 1860 their money was financing the South in our own Civil War. Their money was the power in World War I in 1914, in the Russian revolution of 1917, the German revolution of 1918, the Spanish revolution of 1935, and World War II of 1940.

That all these wars and revolutions were fought in the name of Democracy is a matter of history, but in reality they were started by or used by the International Bankers to destroy nationalistic governments, whether headed by a King, an Emperor, a Czar, a Sultan, a President, a Parliament or a Congress, and to substitute an international government under something like a UN with its component part, a World Bank. This would consolidate and facilitate their rule.

Nearly one hundred years ago Disraeli, the greatest of British statesmen, said boastfully of the International Bankers who made him Prime Minister of England:

"The people little realize who their real rulers are."

It has rightly been said that while civilized brigandage of today is ashamed of its ancestry, its appetite for plunder is no less ravenous and daring. Modern brigandage is carried on under more euphonious titles, and new methods of robbery are employed. Instead of the "robber king" we have the money king, the coal king, the munitions king, the railroad magnate, the newspaper baron, the automobile czar. Instead of spoils and plunders, we have interest dividends, revenues, rents and coupon clippings.

It is but to repeat a truism to say that changes have taken place in America. The Roosevelt administration brought with it a New Deal. Some shouted "Dictatorship" at the emergency powers granted the president in an effort to ease the worst of all financial panics. Others, with more justification, yelled "State Socialism" at the regimentation of occupations. Under the NRA there was an attempt to regiment industry. Under the TVA public utilities were regimented. Under the AAA the farmers were regimented. With these collectivism invaded Amer-

ica. With subsequent enactments it continued to spread. When the land, industry and various interests of the country are regimented there exists pure unadulterated Socialism.

Present-day capitalism, or the functions of our monetary system, is definitely leading the country to bankruptcy and State Socialism, just as it did the older sister democracies controlled by International Finance, namely England and France. Liberty, Freedom, Equality are coming to mean liberty to choose which wing of the same bird of prey will govern (the Democratic or Republican) freedom to move from one uncertain job to another, equality before the guns of an enemy every generation. It is all a case of a government monopoly under the power of a money monopoly—a ten-cent government in a dollar system.

In America the public first realized the danger of the one remaining Democracy when contrary to the wishes of 87% of the people, the country was taken into World War II. Of course, the attack on Pearl Harbor unified the people.... However, this country had been officially declared to be “an arsenal for Democracy.” And even a New Deal diplomat knows arsenals are legitimate military objectives. We had been at war with the Berlin-Rome Tokyo axis; a war fought if not declared, as former Ambassador to England, Joseph P. Kennedy, and others admitted. Anyone knowing Japan had a pact with Berlin and Rome should have expected such an attack as was visited on the Pacific islands.

In fact, if America had followed the wishes of the people, as they supposedly do in a Democracy, and remained neutral the war would have been over before the fatal day of December 7, 1941. The alternative, it is true, would have been the defeat of England. The bankers could not endure the thought of England receiving what she has for centuries imposed on people in every section of the world and tried to impose on us three different times—in 1775, 1812, and 1861. It is not that the bankers love England, but that they love her sources of plunder. But England is as dead in victory as she would have been in defeat anyway, and these men knew such would be the case. Prime Minister Atlee’s request for a bigger stick to hold over the nation will not matter because once the lion is dead a big stick will be no more effectual than a tiny one.

This world-wide warehouse of treasures (America) received its severest blow when the superiority of German military leadership, instead of court-marshaling an army man for getting a progressive idea, developed a new type of warfare that completely blacked out all glittering military achievements the history of the world had hitherto recorded, and presented this revolutionized method to a gasping world. Such words as “Blitzkrieg,” “Panzer,” “V-weapons,” will remain for history to so credit German leadership.

Thus the money powers had to enlist the services of America in behalf of the bungling British who could not even win the battle of Lybia after taking all the time they needed to concentrate superior numbers of men, planes, tanks, and choosing the exact moment for their “advance.” So superior were they in everything but fighting ability

and leadership (which they tried three times to correct by appointing as many commanders) that England jubilantly announced a few days after the attack that half of Rommel's armed forces were destroyed and Churchill openly asserted that Northern Africa would soon be theirs, "*perhaps in a matter of hours.*"

Churchill was as miserably in error on that score as he was on nearly everything else he said or did. The only advances the British made during the entire war were accomplished by occupying localities voluntarily vacated by the enemy for some cause other than English arms. Rommel retreated in Lybia because he knew America was going to attack his rear when the North African bankers of the international system transferred 25-million francs to Africa.

The big bankers seemed to have sensed the disgusting defeats of the British and the subsequent demise of the Empire. True, assurances are in from England that the Empire is far from extinct. But, as the Grand Rapids Press so graphically observes, for sheer drama, nothing beats a brisk protest by the dear departed, sitting up at its own wake.

The bankers had long ago placed America in a position where war was inevitable. They knew all along that the most precious "Bundles for Britain" were nursed at the breasts of American mothers some eighteen or twenty years previously.

Although concentrating on Germany, they could see the possibility of an "incident" in the Pacific that would do the trick. The United States had frozen Japanese assets in this country, had cut them off from vital supplies, threatened them with war if they attempted to get these supplies elsewhere, and insisted that the Burma Road be kept open in order that munitions destined for the known purpose of shooting Jap[anese] could be sent to China. These were not exactly acts of friendship and placed the last remaining Democracy, whose prosperity under sound finance would subdue every hostile force post-haste, in peril she was not immediately able to realize and hard-pressed to cope with it when it was realized.

Bankers not only made the war inevitable, but wanted the war they made inevitable. History will identify the men who were responsible for directing New Deal policies which violated its promises and best intentions. Talk of paying no attention to Hitler because he didn't keep a promise causes one to wonder if the big bankers didn't have a man who could meet him on equal terms. Reading the three platforms on which Mr. Roosevelt was elected and comparing them with events that followed would indicate an affirmative answer. The superficial observance that since the bankers are the only ones who gain anything by war they must be the only ones who want war, is as real as it is apparent. No one else gains in war. Everyone loses, one side merely losing more than the other. No one wins a war any more than they win a fire, cyclone, pestilence, plague, flood or any other common disaster.

It is not maintained that the big Banks were the whole cause of every war. There were wars long before there was such a thing as an international bank. In fact, it has been re-

ported by someone who made the plausible effort to look it up that in the last four thousand years there have been only 268 years of peace—and eight thousand peace treaties.

To various people this would indicate various things, such as the pride and greed of rulers, the depravity of human nature, and many others. However, it will be shown that in these days of bigger and better wars international finance is the principal cause, making use of the pride and greed of rulers, the depravity of human nature, and many other human means for their purposes. Some thirty years of their intervention in Europe and Asia have made peace a vagabond, bankruptcy a normal condition and war a natural expectancy. They are now forcing the world into this routine farther and faster than ever before.

Every international device of the present—United Nations, Bretton Woods, World Court, International Trade Organization, and the rest—seek to make all the more secure the powers of internationalism at the expense of true American Democracy, as will be seen. Certainly Democracy cannot remain in its present form beset by the abuses of modern Capitalism, its system of finance.

"Democracy is in danger for the very reason that democratic government itself is subservient to the sectional interests which control finance, and which have it in their power to inflict a financial crisis upon the nation should they anticipate legislation inimical to their own particular interests."

– Vincent Cartwright Vickers in *"Economic Tribulation."*

Where American Democracy goes depends upon what Americans do about correcting the abuses of the modern Capitalistic system of international finance. This system wanted war because a generation of peace would have left Germany dominating the world without firing a shot. But if Americans arise and abolish this diabolic international system of finance in favor of a sound constitutional system, America will be so powerful internally and externally that the most prosperous and powerful competitors will be just another nation or group of nations progressing more or less on their own ways

One of the most graphic, yet most tragic indications of American greatness is the astronomical debt with which bankers have burdened her. No other nation has been oppressed with even an approximation of this load because only America is rich, powerful and resourceful enough to survive under it. Of course, the internationalist rake-off is proportionately greater in this country although all under banker domination are robbed to their breaking point. It is no mere coincidence that these Shylocks have forced America to pay for two world wars and lay substantial down-payments on the third.

American Democracy given a chance to function freely under a sound financial system would dissolve all revolutions against its system which result in the opprobrium of Fascism, Nazism, Communism, Socialism, all of which declare themselves to be first and

foremost anti-Capitalistic. It is the attack on Capitalism (a system of finance) which brings the attack on Democracy (a system of government.) Anti-Capitalism (a system of finance) brings Fascism, Nazism, Communism, Socialism (systems of government).

Whatever happens to our Democracy (our system of government) depends on what Americans will do towards correcting the abuses of modern Capitalism (our system of finance) controlled by individual interests. The international bankers care nothing about the form of government they steal from, for no matter what its political, racial or economic hue they are the de facto rulers and in the philosophy of their founder, Meyer Amschel Rothschild, care not who makes the laws of the nations as long as they issue and control the money.

But with a successful fight for a completely Constitutional money system based on the knowledge of money and its functions, America, under the dollar sign, will conquer the devastating “isms” of the world and establish inviolable the inherent potential blessings of Democracy.

America will never be destroyed from without though the hosts arrayed against her be ten times the force of a Hitler But she is being destroyed from within by a condition which Americans alone can remedy. Since it is the abuse of the monetary system that is bringing her downfall in circumstances of depression and warfare, the correction of the monetary system will by the same force of logic bring her heights of prosperous stability both internally and externally. Capitalism will not save America; America must save Capitalism. Poverty, fear, debt, and warfare are not essential Capitalism; they are abuses of it. The cure of Capitalism lies in the cure of our thoroughly dishonest and incompetent monetary system.

The Marshall Plan for internationalizing American wealth was not originated by Secretary Marshall at all. In fact it is not even a plan—it is just another planless scheme to raid American pocket books for private interests. The so-called Marshall Plan is a cover, or tries to be one, for the would-be world-straighteners, who have gotten the country and the world in a terrible mess and now are trying to get them out of it by committing a bigger blunder at the expense of the American people. It plays directly into Communist subversive plans in forcing the United States to spend herself into destruction as Lenin wanted. Stalin might well be laughing up his sleeve at this latest stupidity on the part of American Capitalism because it plays as directly into his eager hands as if he had directed it himself. He knows his so-called hatred of the “plan” and the Europe organization of Communists to combat it will only increase American efforts to betray herself into his palms. In fact, Lenin said:

“We shall force the United States to spend herself into destruction.”

A look at the crowd behind the “Marshall Plan” reveals the wolf of International finance under the sheepskin of benevolence. There are, among others, Robert Lovett, a former banker to the key position of Undersecretary of State; William Martin, former Stock Exchange

president, now head of the Export Import Bank; Charles E. Saltzman—one-time Stock Exchange president to the State Department; Robert Garner of the International Bank; Lewis Douglas, experienced financier, at present Ambassador to Great Britain; and Andrew Overly, a former banker, now representative of the United States on the International Fund.

International Finance, especially its Wall Street branch is as tremendously active in the administration of the “Marshall Plan” as it was in adoption of the abortive scheme.

For every dollar congress votes in foreign aid, Wall Street gets its kickbacks, fees, and commissions, especially since it exercises either direct or indirect control over much of American industry which will supply the capital equipment being given away under the Marshall Plan and other schemes to “rebuild the world.” The state department thus has become largely an investment trust through which the insiders profit without risk at the expense of the taxpayers.

In the 16-nation council of donation beneficiaries the private international money racketeer is so potent that it would not be surprising to see this same 16-nation council turn out to be the beginning of a U.S. of Europe. Such a consolidation would, under such an auspice, be of benefit only to International Finance.

Just where the billions necessary for this silly notion are to come from not one of our Boy Scout diplomats has ventured to say. It certainly will not come from the Treasury of the United States because her debt is larger than the combined total of all the nations we are “saving.” As Congressman Lemke said:

“Our national debt, with future obligations, now amounts to some \$643,000,000,000. This is about four times the total indebtedness of all the other nations. It is more than twice the normal value of all of the property in the United States....”

In America Capitalism is identified with Democracy which has suffered immeasurably from the abuses of Capitalism. Democracy has been staggering under repeated body blows in America after being knocked out in every world power on the globe. Britain is no Democracy, because the legislators come from the upper two percent of the population and because the people of the British Isles comprise about one tenth of the Empire’s population, yet make laws for the entire Empire. In fact, until the phrase “*Make the world safe for Democracy*” became so useful, neither Britain nor France ever thought of themselves as democracies. No matter which of the parties, Liberal, Conservative, Labor or Socialist may win an election, a money aristocracy is really in control.

“Democracy” is a term applied to foreign peoples with whom the propagandists want to engage the sympathy of the American public. Hence, when Italy attacked Greece, presto! Greece automatically became a “Democracy” although she was denounced as a dicta-

torship and a tool of Hitler a few months previously. Other examples could be cited but each of them makes one fact clear, namely: The time has come to drop the term "Democracy" from the dictionary of political polemics because it now means everything and anything and consequently means nothing. Even Russia was until recently included among the "Democracies" and, in spite of the layers of blood covering her pitch black soul, this world's capital of anti-religion was named among those fighting for "Christian civilization" by those who spent billions of American dollars to save the Communist regime in Russia and now want to spend \$22-billion to check its spread. The money Power needed the Communists to help them destroy Germany and its unorthodox money system. Now they want to get rid of their former pals who also have an unorthodox money system.

Citadels of Chaos presents little, if anything, that is new. The author, however, believes it to be the first work to analyze and synthesize all accessible information on the progressive development of international finance into a logical, step by step pattern. The completed story (if it can be called complete because of its necessarily condensed presentation) reveals that the methods and objectives in all phases of international finance dovetail. They are parts of a great design, the subtle craftsmanship of which were amazing and startling to the author, as indeed they will be to all who read them.

Chapter II

Dove of Peace and Pigeon of War

"The development of our financial oligarchy followed ... lines with which the history of political despotism has familiarized us—usurpation by gradual encroachment rather than by violent acts; and by subtle and often long-concealed concentration."

This statement was made by Louis D. Brandeis, former Justice of the Supreme Court. For most people the fact needs substantiation, so it will be worthwhile to look at the gradual encroachment by which our financial oligarchy has usurped the supreme prerogatives of any nation. The development of this theme and examination into the results of this usurpation is history's most sordid and mankind's most woeful page.

It is not necessary to look into the history of all banking in general. The banks of ancient Greece and Rome, the money changers of the time of Christ, the early Genoses and Venetian bankers, the tenth century banks of Lisbon and elsewhere, have no bearing on this work. This is strictly an outline of the monetary system which has given various nations of the world a ruin for their money.

From Roman times almost to the discovery of America there was no important addition to the world's supply of precious metals. Yet these metals were considered a necessary basis for the issuance of money although ordinary observation showed that a country's productivity generally increased gradually from generation to generation. The absurdity of basing this increase on the accidents of commerce and mining was not understood until it was virtually impossible for that faceless nonentity, the common man, to do anything about it.

Medieval Europe lived under a managed currency. It was managed this way: The comparatively fixed amount of gold and especially silver was made to fit increased production by reducing from time to time the weight of metal in every coin. This means of increasing the monetary supply offset the increased quantity of goods and kept the price level constant. Prices varied less in a hundred years than they often vary in one year of our own times.

In 1542 Henry VIII began to debase coinage. He did it in the hope that he would be able to pay some of his debts for nothing. Keeping secret what he was doing, he collected all the coin that was paid him and issued it from the Mint with a baser alloy. By doing this he was able to pay out one-fourth more than he received. It was a clever trick, but was soon discovered. To prevent any disastrous results of this discovery, he simply raised the price of metals so that all who possessed gold or silver brought them to the mint. Then he went back to his old trick and reissued baser metal coins.

Foreign nations were reluctant to take this debased money. They did not care whether there was alloy in the coin or not, because most of the English coin got back to England anyway when they purchased goods from her. What they feared was a falling price-level. If they could have been assured that the coin would buy as many goods on the day when the debt should be collected as it did on the day it was incurred, they would have been perfectly willing to accept payment in paper.

It is elementary that if gold and silver came into England somebody brought them. Although much of it came as a result of piracy, most of it came from a new sort of trade—the exchange of goods against gold and silver. This new trade was carried on between England and Europe, especially Spain. The continent was getting consumable goods and England unconsumable metal. Since, as Adam Smith truly said, the one object of production is consumption, it is not surprising that with such a commerce as this the reign of Elizabeth, who succeeded Henry, should be filled with the poor's complaints of their desperate poverty.

Why did Elizabeth tolerate this disadvantageous commerce? The notion that she did not understand the plain consequences of filling the country with silver and emptying it of goods is out of the question. The woman was no idiot. She knew it was against her interests but could not stop it because she was not free to follow a wiser policy. She was the servant of stronger forces that guided her. It was also against the interests of the impoverished masses because it caused an artificial scarcity of commodities. But it was quite definitely advantageous to the interests of those who sold goods in exchange for gold and silver.

These stronger forces, these men who profited on artificial scarcity at the expense of the masses, were goldsmiths, forerunners of international bankers. They were indifferent to the rise in prices for they immediately invested their gains in land and houses whose prices rose with the general upswing. They were in reality the masters of the state No one could prevent them from passing the burden of higher prices to the poorer masses. They were powerful enough to prevent the queen from passing on to them the burden of her increased expenses in the form of increased taxation.

When Charles came to the throne in 1660 a great issue had to be fought out. The new theory of monarchy was that the King should have no capital of importance but should be entirely dependent upon a regular income voted to him by Parliament. In this manner parliament hoped to be able to control the King's conduct and in practice took care to vote him an insufficient income, thereby compelling him to contract debts. Charles' policy had been to gain the throne on whatever terms he could and then attempt to find the means by which he could trick those who restored him and escape their clutches.

Now came the age of the first rumors of invention. More and better roads and bigger and better ships opened the way for the development of commerce. England could get from India the consumable goods she wanted and could get rid of some ... gold and sil-

ver she did not want. Charles exploited this advantage and supplied paper money for the conduct of internal economy. Before his experimentation of negotiable paper he had, like his predecessors, issued his creditors tallies. These tallies were notched pieces of hazel or lindenwood about an inch thick. The amount due from the state was designated by notches cut into one of the flat sides and was written in ink on the two adjacent sides. The piece was then split lengthwise through the notches, one piece being given the payee, the matching piece being retained in the treasury as a method of preventing counterfeiting. When payment was made by the treasury the split edges were matched and were said to "tally," hence the derivation of the word tally.

The tallies proved to be inconvenient for negotiation. The wisdom of issuing negotiable paper was evident but not entirely new. Paper money had long since been invented in China and was now coming into use in various parts of the world. The English colonies were beginning to utilize this convenient form of money. The goldsmiths were powerful enough to defeat the king's attempt. Had he succeeded, had it become recognized that when new money was required to keep an increased supply of goods flowing at a normal rate, it was the business of the government to issue it, the history not only of England but of the whole world would have been changed for the better. It will be seen how this ruinous system was maintained as a basis of today's finance.

The goldsmiths originally were the custodians of the metals people deposited with them for safe keeping. They would put these metals in a strong-box and issue receipts for the amount deposited. In a short time the depositors recognized the convenience of passing these receipts among themselves instead of going to the inconvenience of withdrawing their gold from the strong-box and exchanging the cumbersome metal. The goldsmiths soon observed this practice and decided that since only a small portion of the metal was called for they could safely issue an increase of negotiable paper up to ten times the amount that was actually secured by gold—and gold they did not own at that. Since they drew interest on these, it is easy to see that the practice was quite lucrative. It is also understandable why they should oppose the experiment Charles made with paper money. They brought into discredit the paper orders that Charles issued.

Conveniently for them, Charles issued the papers for large sums and the recipients naturally wanted to change them for smaller ones. The goldsmiths offered to change them and, in return for the king's orders gave their clients their own notes or promises to pay in the future. They refused to change these notes except at a large discount and thereby brought Charles orders into ridicule. Of course, they vehemently held that a stable price level could not be maintained under his policy. They also did what they could to persuade their clients that it would be foolish to change their notes to cash. Lies and intrigues have always been a necessary part of their trade.

The practice of clipping and melting coins naturally came into the hands of the London goldsmiths now for the first time emerging as bankers, or money-lenders. Clipping, incidentally, was the practice of chipping pieces of metal from the coins, thereby reducing their metallic content; milled edges, which could have been used long before they were, finally prevented this practice. These newly emerged bankers, according to Clarendon, *"did not consist above the number of five or six men, some of whom were aldermen and had been Lord Mayors of London."* The names of the two best known were Viner and Blackwell.

Thus in the year 1672, while he was in the middle of the Dutch War, Charles was saddled with a heavy expenditure which Parliament refused to meet by taxation and for which his creditors were reluctant to accept his discredited paper orders. It was a big year for the new bankers. Somebody had to be blamed for the crisis of 1672 and, as it was not to be the bankers, the only alternative was that it would have to be the king. Therefore, from now on the bankers had two objectives, (1) to weaken the monarchy politically so as to make sure it did not strengthen itself financially, (2) to confuse the public over the story of 1672 so they would think it was the king and not they who were responsible for public suffering, thus diverting attention from inquiry into what they were doing.

In 1694 William II came to the throne of England. He soon discovered that he inherited the tremendous financial problems of Charles which were aggravated still further under his predecessor, Cromwell, who had opposed Charles. He needed increased expenditures because they were again at war with Holland. After various schemes had failed, a bill was piloted through Parliament by Montague, then Lord of the Treasury and a name still high in the ranks of international finance, which led to the establishment of the Bank of England under the leadership of a man named William Patterson.

This newly formed corporation promised to collect the required money from the public and to lend it to the king at 8% interest, plus four thousand pounds annually for expenses. In return the bank received a number of privileges, the most important of which was the right to issue notes up to the extent of its loan to the government under their common seal on the security of the government. Furthermore, the bank was authorized to issue six million dollars worth of its own promissory notes that were to circulate as fiat money. These fiat notes had no form nor even a promise behind them, but they were the basis of credit loans for several times six million for which the bank was allowed to charge as much interest as it desired, or thought it could get.

Nothing was said about ever repaying the six million; it never has been repaid. Parliament did not see the power it had bestowed, or that it had sold the control of the government to a gang of moneychangers.

If a one pound note, which this corporation had the right to issue, was brought by the holder to demand his pound, the Bank could by right demand the government to raise the

amount by taxation. As Disraeli put it, *"The principle of that system was to mortgage industry in order to protect property."* And as Patterson, who with Hublon was originator of the Bank explained, with charming simplicity:

"The Bank hath benefit to the interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing."

The present Governor of our Federal Reserve Board says substantially the same thing of our system today. Chester G. Davis, former Governor of the Federal Reserve Board said:

"We Bankers have the power to create and destroy money. The power to create and destroy money is a gigantic power."

The terrible truth is just that simple. If they had engaged in such practices a few years earlier they would have been hanged or burned at the stake for engaging in usury, which was a capital offense on the statutes. The statutes remained but the Bankers could begin doing as they universally do now—make their own laws and their own exceptions.

The way the Bank created money out of nothing is further explained by Patterson:

"If the proprietors of the Bank can circulate their own foundation of twelve hundred thousand pounds without having more than two or three hundred thousand pounds laying dead at one time, this Bank will be in effect as nine hundred thousand or a million pounds of fresh money brought into the nation."

In practice it did not keep a cash reserve of any amount approaching that proportion any more than they do today. By 1696 it was circulating close to two million pounds worth of notes against a cash reserve of only thirty-six thousands.

The monarchy was caught in a trap from which it was never to escape. The maddest believers in the divine right of kings had never fashioned in their wildest imaginations a tyranny one hundredth part as strong and cruel as that which was foisted upon an unsuspecting people by this enactment. William III had been caught in what was perhaps the cleverest trick of blackmail in all history. If he repudiated his debts, his creditors would have supported James, and William would have lost his throne. If he tried to pay his debts he would have to get Parliament to vote him the money in extra taxation. The Bank had taken the precaution of seeing that their influence was sufficient to keep the money from being voted.

Christopher Hollis, in his books, *"The Two Nations"* and *"The Breakdown of Money,"* has contributed much to the cause of Truth and is the outstanding source for much of the material on the early history of the Bank of England. He points out that if a corporation such as this newly formed Bank of England lends its money at interest and without risk, then relends the repaid loan and so on, never distributing more than a trifle of its profits

either as wages or as dividends, then, however small its original capital and however moderate its rate of interest, it is but a simple proposition in mathematics that in the course of time it must necessarily become the possessor of the entire wealth of the country.

The Bank was conceived in intrigue, born in treachery, nursed in hypocrisy, weaned on deceit, raised on oppression and grew into the most insatiable monster of all times.

The Bank of England, which was a private corporation privately run for private profits, had usurped the sovereign rights of the English people. But this pattern was not to remain national in character for long. The first pronounced indication of the international aspect of this system had its advent with the entrance of the name Rothschild upon the ledgers of European history.

The great Banking Empire was started in 1800 by Meyer Amschel Rothschild, who made an early and modest advent into the affairs of international finance by extending his first foreign loan to the Danish government. Shortly afterward he became trustee of the tremendous fortune of William of Hesse Cassel, who fled from his country before an invading French army. Meyer Amschel buried the fortune, periodically digging up parts of it to lend out at high rates of interest. The Rothschild domain became international when this man established his five sons in as many European countries. Amschel was set up in Frankfort, Germany; Solomon, in Vienna, Austria; Carl in Naples, Italy; James in Paris, France; and Nathan, the best known of all the Rothschilds, in London, England. Nathan was employed by the English treasury and quickly rose to power when he staked all he was worth on an Allied victory over Napoleon. Without doubt, some of the stories concerning his exploitation border on the dramatic and even fantastic. The more conservative historians such as Corti and Reeves relate the facts in a more reliable fashion.

News of Blucher's defeat two days before Waterloo caused a crash in the security prices. Nathan's method of securing the news of battle caused him to receive reliable information ahead of anyone else. His agents employed carrier pigeons from the battlefield of Waterloo to the port of Ostend, from where it was brought to him across the channel by his own boat. A few maintain that the carrier pigeon detail is exaggerated since the ordinary means of transmitting news was relayed by personal couriers. However, all agree that he was the first to have an accurate account of the proceedings. When he learned that Napoleon had been defeated, he reported publically that Napoleon had won, thereby causing the security prices to fall completely. He and his agents bought up all securities they could at disastrously low prices.

When the truth finally leaked out to the populace, securities rose rapidly in the midst of great rejoicing over the victory. Stocks rose to unprecedented heights and Nathan unloaded. Nathan boasted that he had multiplied the family capital 2,500 times in five years. Had he but doubled the fortune, it would have been an extremely profitable

deal. Had he multiplied it ten times, it would have been phenomenal, but when he increased it not only by the hundreds, but even thousands of times, superlatives are helpless in conveying an actual picture of the results.

Rothschild was prepared to send a pigeon to Paris with news of French defeat in case the French won. He would then have gone before broken hearted France as he did England and told them of his profound patriotism, how he would gladly buy their worthless bonds.... Rothschild, like international bankers ever since, would have won, no matter who lost. Nations' toiling millions of honest citizens have only to tighten their belts, work harder and pay more into ... Bankers' Banks.

It is no wonder the defeated Napoleon, one of history's greatest military generals, declared bitterly that the Rothschild clique was *"without honor, without patriotism, and without any god than their own system of usurious profits."* It has been said that after Waterloo, no power resisted the usurer. Rother said of Nathan's influence,

"The Rothschild in this country has an incredible influence upon all financial affairs here in London. It is widely stated, and indeed is almost a fact, that he entirely regulates the rate of exchange in the city. His power as a banker is enormous."

Disraeli said,

"He was lord and master of the money markets of the world and, of course, virtually lord and master of everything else."

That he was virtually lord master of everything else is easily understood by considering the function of money.

Kingdoms have toppled in Europe, empires have been shattered, customs have been lost in the dust of time, but the Rothschild brothers by intermarriage and close coordination of their money temples throughout the world, have built an international dynasty that grows more secure each year. For more than a century the Rothschilds have sat in their counting houses and controlled the military and economic destinies of the world. Their influence is still measured in the subservience of governments. In times of war they always stuck together regardless of the alignment of the embroiled nations. They pooled their resources when necessary and thus provided sufficient funds for the debtor combatant to emerge victoriously from the battlefields. Their loyalty was not to their adopted nations, but to their fortunes and one another. Like all international bankers ever since, they had no nationalistic patriotism. Their flag was colorless.

It is true that the original Rothschilds were also a force for peace, but only when peace better served their purposes. For example, James wrote to Solomon in 1831,

"...Everything now depends upon the foreign Powers, and that is where you must bring your influence to bear; for if we do not preserve peace no Power will be able to maintain its credit and rents will not remain as firm as I hope."

At another time, Nathan wrote Solomon, who in turn passed the information on to Metternich,

"Our government has taken very strong measures against France, and these should make a very good impression throughout Europe; that is to say, if France does not remain quiet, but takes action against the other three Powers, we shall join the three Powers, but if the other three Powers take action against France, we shall join France."

Because money is essential for the transacting of business, it is not surprising that the Rothschilds were soon dominating all major business functions just as the Rothschilds of today should reach out into the steel, railroad, munitions, aviation, news and other businesses. Schwmer says Amschel had his finger in every pie; he dealt with the business of the Federation as well as with that of the individual German governments, and supplied the money with the railways that were being constructed everywhere at the time. After railroads, they turned their attention to steamships. This is indicated by the very name of the big Austrian steamship line in which Solomon interested himself financially. "Lloyd" was the name given to the shipping company by the ship owners and insurers of men and merchandise (the first insurance was applied to vessels at sea) who met and did business in a London coffee house owned by Mr. Lloyd. Soon afterwards, large concessions for mining and establishing iron works were granted the Rothschilds. These broadening spheres of domination persevered from the founders to the present day.

Thus today we find Melville Rothschild president of the National Bond and Investment Company. This credit syndicate purchases from automobile dealers notes arising from the retail sale of new and used cars. It places through an insurance agency, which is a wholly owned subsidiary, insurance securing the indebtedness of financed automobiles. Rothschild companies thereby collect several tributes from their victims, profits on the materials from which automobiles are made, from railroads over which they are carried, for interest charges on loans to car purchasers and then, as if that were not enough, it soaks them for the purchase of insurance to protect the loans.

Although many honors have been bestowed upon the Rothschilds by subservient powers, no Rothschild has ever occupied a throne, probably because it was more profitable not to. When thrones became vacant they were asked to advise who should occupy them. It pleased, and still pleases, them better that all crowns, mythical and real, should be at their feet rather than that they should be wearing them on their heads. The majority of the European peoples, Borne long ago suggested, would have attained their freedom had

not the Rothschilds and other financiers applied their wealth to the support of absolutism. Borne described the operations of the Rothschilds, showing how they would depress “rents” just before underwriting a loan, and then artificially raise the price immediately after an agreement for a new loan was signed. Such was the game the Rothschilds always played, enriching themselves at the expense of the country they exploited.

Napoleon Bonaparte writing from Boulogne September 24, 1805, said:

“The evil originates in the bank having transgressed the law. What has the law done? It has given the privilege of coining money in the form of paper to a particular company. In a word in discounting after this manner, the bank is coining false money. So clearly do I see the dangers of such a course that, if necessary, I would stop the pay of my soldiers rather than persevere in it. I am distressed beyond measure at the necessities of my situation, which by compelling me to live in camps and engaging in distant expeditions, withdraws my attention from what would otherwise be the chief object of my anxiety, the first wish of my heart—a good and solid organization of all that concerns the interests of banks, manufacturers and commerce.”

When the present Duke of Windsor decided, as King Edward VIII, to abdicate his throne, it is significant that he first took refuge at the Rothschild castle at Enzesfeld, Austria. Writing of the event, an Associated Press article by Albert Wilson says,

“Depending on the flourish of a pen in the hand of a Rothschild, armies of Europe for a century have starved and lost or had their bully beef and won. Britain from the time of the Duke of Wellington; the rulers of Prussia, Bavaria and other states down to the time of the Kaiser; the builders of the Austrian empire and the Kings of the nations formed out of it; the Bourbons and the Republicans of France—all in their time have crossed a Rothschild threshold in search of their destiny even as Edward has.”

The domain of this famous banking family now reaches to the four corners of the earth. Their central banks in Europe are supplemented by other institutions in every large country of the globe. Lord Thomas Sivewright Catto, like his predecessor Montague Norman as governor of the Bank of England, and Thomas Lamont, like his predecessor J. Pierpont Morgan in the United States, are intimately associated with the Rothschilds and frequently confer with them. One of the largest enterprises operated by the clan is the World Bank [Bank for International Settlements] in Basel, Switzerland, which was part of the machinery of the League of Nations and the World Court. The most ambitious objective imputed to this institution was a proposal by Lord Dudley a few years ago to set up a consolidation of world business, like world banking, under one huge control, to be dominated by the

World Bank [Bank for International Settlements] at Basel, the Bank of England and the United States Federal Reserve Bank. If anyone discovers a similarity between this and the present World Bank, the World Court, and the United Nations Organization it will be discovered that the relation is not as accidental as it might sound. The biggest difference is that they are succeeding this time. This means that the second World War was for them an even bigger success than the first.

Many other names have shown up in the fields of international financing, but the broadening field originated and dominated by the Rothschilds has absorbed their policies and practices.

The Morgan dynasty, following the Rothschild practices, is even more alarming to the people of the United States. The philosophy of the late J. Pierpont Morgan is plainly indicated in a statement he made publicly, namely: *"Anybody is justified in doing anything so long as the law doesn't say it's wrong."* According to this monstrous doctrine, it was not wrong to take the lead in getting us into war, getting money out of the United States government and out of the American taxpayers, and giving the American people the war, the death, and the taxes, because there was no law saying it was wrong. He might have gone further and said that even the existing laws did not mean anything to him if he didn't want them to, for he often times proved what Montague Norman, former governor of the Bank of England, boasted—that he was above the law.

A few years prior to the late World War, the House of Morgan controlled about one-fourth of the corporate wealth of America. Morgan and his partners owned thirteen great banks and controlled 219 other banks, through the Morgan empire held directorships in 2,264 corporations in the United States. Financial assets which this mighty group controlled was estimated to aggregate 75 billions of dollars. Under direct Morgan control were the leading industrial companies and corporations, the top ranking banks and trust companies, our best railroad systems, the top utility companies and some of the outstanding insurance and holding companies. This machine has corrupted the economic system of the nation. It has thwarted every move in the direction of social betterment. It has plundered labor and agriculture. Step by step it has concentrated wealth in the grasp of a few individuals.

These money empires amply illustrate an observation made by Pope Pius XI, universally respected for his sanctity and wisdom. He wrote in the papal encyclical, "Quadragesimo Anno":

"This power (economic domination) becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able to govern credit and to determine its allotment, supplying so to speak, the life-blood of the entire economic body, and grasping in their hands as it were, the very soul of production so that none dare breathe against their will."

Before proceeding to see how they have taken over the United States, some of the other leading countries of the world, and how they caused two World Wars, it is worthwhile to see why the plain historic facts so far related are not more generally known. People often ask, *"Why haven't we been taught these things?"* There is a historic answer to this pointed inquiry aside from the disastrous effect the light of Truth and Knowledge would now have upon the iniquitous monstrosity of international finance that currently enslaves the world.

The facts concerning the origin of international finance, as well as those which follow concerning its development and domination are without exception not open to serious dispute. They are supported by numerous references and voluminous research. They are commonplace in numerous important books of admitted authority, but it is especially among reputable English authors that the material on the origins of the international system is to be found. Further valuable information is found among the opponents of the bills which enacted banking legislation. A study of University files and logical deductions from the "facts" given by "orthodox" historians are also valuable.

History, as it is taught, is marred by serious faults besides the usual accusation of occasional bias. The serious fault is the complete neglect of monetary history and the functions of monetary systems. The stories of any great catastrophe of history as told by a student of money and as told by an ordinary textbook are quite at variance. The textbook speaking of the War of American Independence, for example, explained it entirely by political causes. It is now the agreed admission of the economists of every school that this view is a most serious distortion of the truth. There can be no dispute about the fact that our economy is built up by the bankers lending money they do not possess and never did possess. Nor can there be any sensible dispute about the importance of the fact. The textbook records that a war was fought; it does not record who directed the statesmen, who financed it or who paid for it. Historians reading the private papers of the Rothschilds found there a record of the intimate relations between every statesman of Europe and the members of the great family—a family not even mentioned in texts. The school books tell us that the Metternichs, the Bismarks, the Cavours, the Napoleons, and such like, were the masters of Europe. It is easily proved that these men were dominated by this greater power of finance.

Since most of the readers of this book will be those who have learned their history at school and have not had the time or inclination to study it since, it was thought wise to insert a few words on this aspect of history, for to them this narrative might seem like a wild fairy tale. Scarcely one of these facts will be found in the history books of our school days.

If the truths in these pages are admitted, and their importance is likewise admitted, why were we not taught them in school?

It is a story but little less sordid than the story of the bankers themselves. The highest institutions of learning, the Universities, especially Oxford, were Tory. *"In those seats of*

education instead of being formed to love their country and its constitution, the laws and liberties of it, they are rather disposed to love arbitrary government and to become slaves to absolute monarchy," was written by Brunet the historian of the reformation. It was he, incidentally, who first suggested the national debt which was so unpopular among the poorer classes because they had to support it with taxes. Therefore, a Whig history had to be written in order to show the people, *"What are the methods bad princes have taken to enslave us and by what conduct we have been preserved."*

So the Whig history was written and titled, "History of Our Own Times." The problem now was to get it read; to capture the educational machine. This was done by means of endowed teachers, professors and stooges, principally under the direction of Townsend and Gibson.

Now what was the history which these endowed teachers taught? It was an entirely new theory called the progressive theory of history. It was a theory which as a result of their activities was soon to be accepted without criticism. It was a theory designed to cover up the traces of truth. It was the avowed purpose of that history to create the feeling that, as bad as things might be at the moment, the lesson of history has been a lesson of steady improvement, that each present generation as always, as Macaulay put it. *"the most enlightened generation of the most enlightened people that ever existed."* Where there was evil, that evil was the relic of an evil past; where there was good, the good was a product of the increasing advancement which runs through the ages and which was assuredly leading us to a yet more glorious horizon ahead. Doesn't that theme sound more than vaguely familiar in our texts and propaganda of today?

This theory was not seriously believed in the 18th century and was taught to quiet those who did not belong to the ruling classes. Shortly after the end of the 18th century this progressive theory of history received general acceptance among those who claimed for themselves the prestige of educated people. It is certain, therefore, that the coming generations, during their formative years, and during the only years in which they might have leisure for study, did not come in contact with the most serious problem that had become a fateful reality, and yet, in this world of unreality, they acquired qualifications which they imagined entitled them to positions of command in the realities of a real world. Admiration for Homer is indeed laudable, but to advise a young man whose business it was to reform the credit structure of a monetary system to read Homer every day sounds, in the light of reality, like the advice of a maniac.

Now, how did this perversion of history play into the hands of the all powerful bankers? Simply by making them secure against the dangers of publicity. The power of usury was about to extend its control over the state and its misled citizens.

After forty centuries, the students are still in the primary class as far as economics are concerned.... But the riddle of interest remained. Interest is a vicious means of enslavement that was born of hoardable money in the hands of man animated by self-interest.

Instead of slaying the monster, its safety has been guarded by depressions and wars throughout the ages. The founders of economic chaos remain as highly respected as though interest were a blessing or of divine origin.

Long ago, men worshipped the Golden Calf. This creature has given place to the God of Gold that created interest, and which has again been firmly entrenched, though in a veiled form, by the makers of the international Bretton Woods Agreement, the international bankers in order to enslave the nations and permit no escape.

Today the powers of finance control many universities, many newspapers and other publishing houses. For example, Paul H. Warburg, a co-founder of the Federal Reserve system, was also a chairman of the board of directors of the Carnegie Foundation, and personally approved all fellowships and professorships to Universities which accept their specialists. No one is so naive as to suppose he would appoint a man unsympathetic with his views. Many public schools and Universities are kept going by gigantic endowments obtained through a usurious monetary system and preserve their secret manipulation of money by teaching false ethics and false economics. More of this subservience of professors to monetary interests will be seen when we deal with the causes of American entrance in the last World Wars.

The textbook publishers are often under the thumb of the bankers in several ways, one of which is calling in their loan in order to take the business and run it with someone who will be a stooge. A look at the publishers of most books that tell history from the financial standpoint, and not merely from politics, will show that they are virtually unheard of. In most instances the book is written by some obscure individual, who had to have the truth printed by a small publisher or printing shop where the real American spirit for Truth and Knowledge had not been purchased, suppressed, or tarnished. Yet in authority, style and other literary qualifications they are often superior to best sellers of larger publishers.

Christopher Hollis writes:

"So long as a few people have the privilege of inventing money, no one in the country except those few people can really own any private property at all. The rest of us and our fancied property are but tenants-at-will of the bankers in the sense that the bankers can, at any time they wish, force us to surrender it. It is idle to say that in practice this does not happen. In practice, this happens every day. Two hundred years ago Berkeley prophesied that it would happen. One hundred years ago Cobbett showed that it was happening. Today we see it happening all around us."

Chapter III

Political Independence, Financial Bondage

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a monied aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and the people to whom it rightfully belongs." — Thomas Jefferson

From their thrones in England, the financial internationalists cast envious eyes toward the juicy plum of Colonial America. The Whig policy was to keep the cost of American labor low. This was done by a supply of African slaves and indentured white laborers—criminals shipped abroad to work for the term of their sentence without wages. When the supply of criminals ran short the wretched were kidnapped from London's streets by creatures of the financialists, known as "spirits," hustled on board a ship and compelled to earn their liberty by service of from five to seven years on an estate in America. These estates were owned by financiers under charters with the British government. The London company which settled in Virginia was largest and most notorious. With the cost of labor low, English capital could realize larger profits on its investments.

Beginning with the arrival of the Mayflower and its load of heroic souls, a great multitude of immigrants began to arrive from across the sea. Ten years later the foundations for nine colonies had been set. The settlers saw but little money and used the barter system of exchanging their goods and products with each other. Indian wampum, black and white shells, which represented certain value among the Indians, found its way into the hands of the whites who learned that it was a satisfactory medium of exchange. Other objects were also used as money. Virginia once used tobacco; the northern colonies and Canada used fur; the Carolinas used rice, and in the 1780's South Carolina used whisky as money. In New England codfish, and later handmade nails were considered currency. Massachusetts once employed butter for the same purpose. Wampum finally became legal tender throughout several colonies.

Since stomachs don't change from generation to generation, it is easy to see why a new Colony must subsist on loans for the first few years. They must consume and are not yet ready to produce. When the Colonies began producing, they found they still could not get out of debt because the "Old Lady from over the Sea" compelled them to regulate their currency on a shifting amount of gold and silver. It soon became apparent that trade was hindered because of an insufficient and inadequate money supply.

So the colonies began to issue their own paper money. Of this brief experiment the great American historian, Bancroft, says:

"This period was marked by unrivalled prosperity of the Colonies. The population, which had doubled in twenty-five years, grew rich through industry."

When Benjamin Franklin made a visit to his native England he was asked how he accounted for the prosperous condition of the Colonies. He said:

"That is simple. It is only because in the Colonies we issue our own money. It is called 'Colonial Script' – and we issue it in proper proportion to the demands of trade and industry."

This circulating medium, Colonial Script, was printed by the Governors of the various Colonies and brought an adequate purchasing power for the abundance of produce and goods that was available now that they had their newly-cleared fields producing.

Something had to be done about this prosperity. It was bringing prosperity to the wrong people. Foreign financiers could no longer loan the Colonies their currency as long as they were keeping plenty of good Colonial money in circulation. So they had to get rid of it somehow.

When the colonies agitated for the right to make a fiduciary issue of paper money, the British Parliament countered in 1751 by passing an act prohibiting an issue of paper money in New York, and this was later extended to other colonies. Benjamin Franklin said:

"On the slight complaint of a few Virginia merchants, the colonies had been restrained from making paper money which had become absolutely necessary for their internal commerce from the constant remittance of their gold and silver to Britain." The English financiers knew that as long as Americans could not get out of debt they could continue to draw steady and permanent dividends from their American investments – a policy in practice today, for the only way we can get more money is by increasing our debts on which the international Bankers draw interest. Franklin complained that the result of the early practice was that "the whole of American wealth centers finally among the merchants and inhabitants of Great Britain."

The purpose of the Bill of 1751 was to restrain Colonial Script and give the authority of law to the King's instructions on currency. The financial powers with Parliament as their tool tried by law to control the Colonies by controlling the issuance of their money in giving the King this dictatorial power. Thus the original charters by which each colony was given authority to issue its own money were not renewed after the date on which they expired. The colonies could no longer issue their own money. Furthermore, they were not allowed to

trade with any country but England, but what was far worse, they had to pay England in the metallic currency of their territories called specie. Here was the plot: drain all the specie out of the American possessions so they would have to borrow from the Bank of England. That was economic slavery and the freedom-loving colonies were not disposed to tolerate it.

When this plot failed, the British began a series of repressive measures against the colonies denying rights long enjoyed, arrogantly usurping authority and imposing revenues and large emoluments attached to all offices. Some wanted to obtain revenues from the Post Office by issuing a general Stamp Act for Americans. But these Americans of whom they knew little and cared less refused to be governed by prerogative. The British sent a special appointee to the governorship of New York for one last great effort. This offensive character asked that the Colonial Assembly, "*consider without delay a proper law for a permanent revenue, solid, definite and without limitations.*" He asked that these requirements be met. The Assembly refused. That was the beginning of the break between the British Government and the Colonies.

While the colonies objected to other oppressive measures on principle, it was the withdrawing of their money (Colonial Script and species) ... that made them particularly rebellious because they knew that such a policy was equal to taking away their freedom, their independence and their prosperity. It was because their circulating medium was reduced and they were paying tribute to the Rothschild Bank that was the original and fundamental cause of the dissatisfactions which led to the Revolutionary War.

George III of England was not oppressive and was probably the least tyrannical of the 18th century monarchs; the tax burden was not excessive, in fact, even with the tax on tea they product was more cheaply bought from England than elsewhere; (our textbooks stress *Tea Parties*, not money) the American standard of living was unsurpassed; the demand for freedom does not diminish the truth that the colonists had a greater measure of self-government than their relatives in Europe; the American leaders such as Washington, Laurens and Dickinson were men of propriety, piety and property which radically distinguished them from other revolutionary leaders of history. Thus the ordinary elements of revolt are not to be found. The plain and simple reasons stem from the fundamental injustice of ... disastrous measures of finance inflicted then, as now, by those Giants of Greed – the private bankers. Franklin knew, for he said:

"The colonies would gladly have borne the little tax on tea and other matters had it not been that England took away from the colonies their money which created unemployment and dissatisfaction."

The English Bankers made no secret of their intention to force the colonies to borrow from and pay tribute to them. They supported their intention with many arguments, which

were ably refuted by Benjamin Franklin. For example, a report of the British Board of Trade argued *“that every medium of trade should have an intrinsic value, which paper has not. Gold and silver are therefore the fittest for this medium, as they are equivalent, which paper can never be.”* Franklin answered in part as follows:

“Any well-founded credit, is as much an equivalent as gold or silver, or it would not be preferred by commercial people in different countries, not to mention again our own American bank: bills.”

Another parallel applicable today is found in a letter Franklin wrote to Lord Kames. He writes:

“I am glad to find that you are turning your thoughts to political subjects and particularly to those of money. . . . The world is yet much in the dark on those important points.... Most of our acts of Parliament for regulating them are, in my opinion, little better than political blunders, owing to the ignorance of science or to the designs of crafty men who mislead the legislature, proposing something under the specious appearance of public good while the real aim is to sacrifice that to their private interests.”

Franklin had been the colonial negotiator in London. He objected to the act restraining the legal tender of paper money, to the stamp act for collecting revenue, and the plan to render assemblies in America useless.

With open hostilities a reality, the Continental Congress was set up. It issued money but, in its haste, it overlooked a law against counterfeiting. There is documentary evidence to show that England dumped shiploads of counterfeit and irredeemable paper on the colonies in a deliberate effort to bring them to their knees. A more important omission on the part of the Congress, perhaps, was the absence of tax laws. It could not redeem its own issuance of money by the power of collecting taxes. This was why the Congress was brought into disrepute and why the phrase, “Not worth a Continental” refers to its money.

When the break between the British government and the Colonies was beyond the hope of being breached another war to force the bankers’ servitude on a happy, free and prosperous people was inevitable. The first armed clashes of the Revolution against Bankerism took place at Lexington and Concord. The war continued ‘for seven years and came to a successful conclusion for the Colonies when Lord Cornwallis and his whole army, including the Hessian soldiers supplied by the Rothschilds to keep America in bonds, was captured at Yorktown. Three years after the Peace of Paris, which recognized the independence of the United States, delegates from most of the states met and drew up the Constitution minus the Bill of Rights. The following year, 1787, the Constitutional Convention was called at Philadelphia. Mindful of the bitter

experience through which the country had passed because the colonies were denied the privilege of creating their own purchasing power and were being forced to accept banker-created, interest bearing, Bank of England money, the Founding Fathers made sure that provisions were made by the Constitution for an honest and debt-free monetary system. In spite of strenuous opposition of banker-minded delegates, the convention drafted and adopted Article I, Section 8, 'Paragraph 5, which reads:

"Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof; and of foreign coin."

With the independence of America established, the big financial interests of Europe immediately used their influence to nullify this independence by nullifying that Article in the Constitution which gave Congress the power to issue money.

Robert Morris, who had long negotiated with France on behalf of the Colonies, was appointed Secretary of the Treasury by Washington. However, Morris refused and, to the great surprise of Washington, Morris recommended that Alexander Hamilton be appointed. Hamilton's loathing of the masses and his long study in financial intrigue made him unsuited for power in a Democracy, but he was active in banking policies. It was the latter that made him acceptable as a substitute. Hamilton immediately and persistently worked for a bank built upon the plan of the Bank of England. As a supposed patriot he busily engaged in planning a double cross—seemingly the first requisite for any successful international banker. Hamilton had his friends in the Legislature buy up a great lot of the cheap Continental money and promised them that if his banking plans were approved, this money would be redeemed at face value with all back interest. With forty-five percent of the legislators possessing this cheap money with the prospect of turning into considerable wealth, the nefarious plans of Hamilton were passed.

This bank restricted its loans, (1) to Englishmen who had lately arrived to get in on the "ground floor" and who at once bought a controlling interest in existing companies, and when this was not possible, started similar companies in competition; (2) made loans to those Merchants who would make their foreign purchases in England; (3) made loans to those American Tories of New York, Boston and Philadelphia, who had opposed our War for Independence. In brief, this "Bank of the United States" restricted its loans as far as possible to those English and Pro-English Americans who could be counted on to aid in placing the American people under the financial tyranny of Mother England—as the inevitable result of this concentration of money and control of credit, it was but a few years until this crew of pro-English pirates had captured the American Ship of State, together with most of its wealth, while those who had fought and won the war of independence had been driven out of business and their properties foreclosed.

In brief, what England had lost at Yorktown and Saratoga, she had regained in New York and Washington, and again the American people, as in the days of the Colonies, were the victims of English tyranny.

Colonial oppression by English bankers through the medium of the British Government caused the Colonies to seek freedom from the British Government. But, through the unscrupulous Hamilton, America did not, and to this day, never did obtain her freedom from the oppression of the banking headquarters in London, England. Americans have never had true liberty. This was not fully realized until the Western frontier ceased to become the haven of all the unfortunate. William Pitt, famous English statesman, openly predicted that our freedom would be a sham if we fell under the same financial interests as England.

Quoting from "History of the Life and Times of James Madison," Olive Cushing Dwinell in "The Story of Our Money," undoubtedly the best documental work on the subject, demonstrates that Hamilton frankly avowed his distrust of both Republican and Federal Government. In his own words he had no scruple in declaring that in his private opinion the British Government was the best in the world, and that he doubted much whether anything short of it would do in America. "*Let one branch of the Legislature,*" he said, "*hold their offices for life or at least during good behavior. Let the executive also be for life.*" His most intimate friend and associate, Robert Morris, said of Hamilton, "*He never failed on every occasion to advocate the excellence and avow his attachment to monarchy . . . he disliked the Constitution . . . and hated Republican Government because he confounded it with Democratical Government.*"

In the Madison diaries Hamilton is quoted as having said in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 that the "rich and well-born" should have a permanently predominant role in government, in order to protect the nation from the "turbulence" of the common people. To this end he proposed a senate and executive elected for life from among the wealthier, propertied classes.

Hamilton urged the convention to make the executive's position permanent and unimpeachable, which would have made for nothing less than a king of the U. S. He looked with disfavor on the republican form of government, he argued for the encouragement of child labor and wanted no one to vote but those who possessed a certain amount of property.

Most significant of the man and the institution he founded is the classic statement of his: "*I loathe the masses.*" He also told Jefferson: "*The people, your people, Sir, is a Great Beast.*"

It is not surprising that a man of Hamilton's type, who hated the Constitution and possessed monarchistic bent, ignored the Constitution on the Money Article and became a fitting father of the family of internationalists who reign even more powerfully today. He supported the financial dictatorship in proposing the Bank of the United States, a private bank of monetary issue. What he was unable to do directly through government, he accomplished indirectly by forcing through Congress his British banking system of private

control of the issuance of our money, thereby controlling government through financial power. In order to pay off the legislators possessing cheap continental money as he promised, he raised a new loan which saddled the country with a permanent National debt which he rightly deemed necessary in order that finance's mastery of national policy should be unshakable. In a letter to Washington, Thomas Jefferson said of Hamilton:

"He wishes it (the National debt) never to be paid, but to be a thing wherewith to corrupt and manage the Legislature."

As Calhoun later put it:

"He thus bound more strongly to the government that already powerful class by giving them, through its agency (the bank) increased profit and a decided control over the currency exchanges in the business transactions of the country."

Alexander Hamilton himself said,

"A National debt, if it is not excessive, will be a national blessing; a powerful cement of union; a necessity for keeping up taxation, and a spur to industry."

His fellow conspirator, Robert Morris, said:

"I am determined that the bank shall be well supported until it can support itself, and then it will support us."

What patriots! It recalls to mind what Senator Rush D. Holt said of certain patriots agitating for World War II. According to the brilliant and independent young Senator, when referring to these patriots we should spell the word "P-A-Y-t-r-i-o-t-s" and pronounce it with a heavy accent on the P-A-Y.

The first Bank of America was organized by Alexander Hamilton and Robert Morris, who John R. Elsom, in "Lightning Over the Treasury Building," truthfully characterized as "front men of the racketeers behind the scenes." This bank was a legal, privately owned corporation, whose charter was to run for thirty years, during which no other bank, public or private, was to be permitted. Its capital and deposits were to be exempt from taxation, and the United States, collectively and particularly, were to become conjointly responsible for all its transactions. Its sources of profit were to be the sole right of issuing a currency for the United States equal in amount to the whole capital stock of the bank.

Of the thirty-five million dollar capitalization of the Bank, four-fifths were provided by European bankers, principally the Rothschilds, and one-fifth by Americans. There is nothing intrinsically difficult in deducing from these figures the identity of the Nation's rulers, nor does it require any special genius to see how American this institution really

was. It seems to have been an evil foreboding that America should have been named after a bank agent. Amerigo Vespucci, instead of being a great sailor as most people believe, was primarily a financial agent for the Medicii family of Italy. He was most important to the discovery of America because he held contracts to outfit the second voyage of Columbus. He was the first bank agent, but by no means the last, to influence America's place in history. In fact, America was settled on the installment plan, the Pilgrim fathers were ten years paying for their passage to the new world; even their homes were mortgaged.

Leading American statesmen such as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, James Madison, and Andrew Jackson, plainly saw that this supposedly American institution was in reality a branch of the Bank of England, and that its policy was one of perpetuating the goldsmiths racket of issuing receipts. This fact precipitated prolonged and bitter controversy throughout the first years of our young Republic, for these men knew that the gaining of National Independence had been accomplished in vain, since the powers England lost through the Revolution would be returned to them through the branch bank set up within our borders. In the scholarly book "The Story of Our Money" the author writes:

"The deliberations in Congress over Hamilton's Bank Bill, and the opinions of members of the Cabinet show the intensity of feeling between the private money interests and those supporting the Constitution. History records that the money changers have used every form of abuse, intrigue, deceit and violent means possible to maintain their control over governments by controlling the money and its issuance "

Nevertheless the Bank of the United States with its ninety branches became a reality. George Washington had entrusted to Hamilton and Morris the duties of the Treasury Department. When Washington approached Hamilton with the unconstitutionality of his proposed bank, Hamilton ingeniously calmed his fears by "selling" the vicious doctrine of "implied powers."

The next succeeding presidents, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, have left voluminous evidence of their strong opposition to the bank as being monarchistic, monopolistic, unconstitutional, detrimental to the country's welfare, dangerous to our peace and prosperity, and foreign to our form of government.

The Bank of America was American neither in conception, origin, theory, practice, nor even in ownership.

The charter of the United States Bank expired by limitation in 1811 and Congress refused to recharter the old bank or to charter a new one. Congress objected to rechartering the Bank on the old constitutional grounds, which had been brought forward by Jefferson when the bank was first chartered. Another reason was that the bank stock was largely

held in England, since the United States government had been led to dispose of its shares in the institution to English investors. President Madison in vetoing the charter's renewal delivered a forceful and irrefutable veto message, stating that it not only failed in its avowed purposes, but it was the source of many national distresses.

Failure to recharter the bank left the field open for State banking. State banks were organized without restriction. The notes of these banks were unduly expanded and a loose system of credit led to inflation. Since much of the stock in the old bank had been bought up by England, it was not a mere coincidence that the War of 1812 was prosecuted against the United States after Congress had refused to renew the bank charter. England was forced to follow the same pattern she had taken earlier by engaging in the Revolutionary War, which took place after the British Empire was unable, after many years of effort, to control the colonies by controlling their money.

By the War of 1812 it was expected that America would become impoverished and would be forced to come on her knees to the Bank of England for funds. Just as she had dumped counterfeit money on the Colonies, England, through financial agents and political intrigue, greatly increased inflation under the state banking system. After the combined effects of inflation and the expenses of war brought ruin to the country, it was planned that the English bank would supply money upon the condition that the charter of their subsidiary bank, the Bank of the United States, would be renewed. This nefarious plan succeeded. In the midst of great financial distress, the movement for a new national bank gained headway in spite of intelligent opposition. A subservient and bribed Congress granted a renewal of the charter and President Madison signed the act in 1816.

The third fight against the banking power found President Andrew Jackson making good his threat when he told the bankers to their faces:

"You are a den of vipers and thieves. I intend to rout you out, and by the eternal God, I will rout you out."

Although the charter was not to expire until 1836, Jackson opened fire on them in his inaugural address in 1829. He fought in the war of Independence at the age of 12, was made a Major General in the army in 1812, decisively defeated the British troops in New Orleans in 1814, held offices as public prosecutor, judge, congressman, governor, and senator, but the most convincing proof of his heroic character is seen in the fact that he was the only man who could meet head-on and defeat the power of international finance. He won a battle, but the war is still on. He was told by the financial interests that they would see that he was defeated for re-election because of his threat not to renew the charter when it expired. Again he told off his enemies to their faces in no uncertain terms that theirs was too much power for any small group to have in a free country, then adding defiance to

statesmanship he told them he would see that the charter was not renewed. It is not without good reasons that Benjamin Franklin and Andrew Jackson have more places in America named after them than have any other men in American history.

Jackson was re-elected by an overwhelming majority that greatly surpassed his first landslide in spite of a deliberate contraction of credit of part of the banks in order to bring about an artificial financial panic which the banks hypocritically blamed on Jackson's attacks. They told Jackson he would ruin ten thousand families. Jackson forcefully and truthfully replied:

"That may be true, gentlemen, but that is your sin! Should I let you go on, you will ruin fifty thousand families, and that would be my sin!"

The bankers fought with the usual means of seeking the subservience of a bribed Congress. Jackson wrote in a letter:

"It is believed that in the last two years it (the bank) has loaned to members of Congress and subsidized presses at least one-half million dollars, the greatest part of which will be lost to the bank and stockholders . . . but such have been the scenes of corruption in our last Congress that I loathe the corruption of human nature, and long for retirement and repose on "The Hermitage," but until I can strangle the hydra of corruption, the Bank, I will not shrink from my duty or my part."

Opposed to him were not only part of his own cabinet, but such national leaders as Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Poindexter, and, of course, the President of the Bank, Nicholas Biddle. Daniel Webster, the great patriotic orator and master of the Senate, was in the pay of the Bank of the United States. The publication of the letters of Nicholas Biddle has revealed one in which Webster explains how he refused to undertake a case against the banks and adds, *"I believe my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the bank should be continued, it might be as well to send me the usual retainers."* The retainers were undoubtedly sent post haste because the famous orator had in pre-retainer days riddled the private issuance of money and credit with such blasts as the following:

"The people wonder why financial panics occur so frequently. I can tell them why. It is to the interests of the bankers and brokers that they should occur. It is one of the specious methods by which these despotic and utterly useless knaves rob the producing, manufacturing and mercantile classes of their honest earnings. It is one of the chief plans by which this infamous ring is riveting the chains of slavery upon the limbs of labor. It is one of the chief means adopted to build up a money aristocracy that shall live in idle luxury and ape the pretentious airs of European nobility."

But arrayed behind Jackson were masses upon masses of men and women who believed in the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who wanted an equal opportunity under law. They were people who believed they had the right to earn a living according to decent standards and believed that democracy meant economic as well as political freedom.

Jackson's veto message, written with the aid of his advisers, (Advisers are ironically called a Kitchen Cabinet when they are Americans strongly defending the Constitution and a Brain Trust when they are internationalists who care little or nothing for the Constitution) on the rechartering of the United States bank was one of the longest and most scholarly ever sent to Congress by any president. It was said to be "*a document not only for its own time and place, but for all history.*" It not only stated the President's objections to the bill before him, but it crystallized for all time all arguments that should be offered against lending the fiscal power and resources of the United States to the use and behoof of any chartered monopoly whatsoever. Its tone was moderate, its temper unruffled, its style lofty, its diction clear, dignified and forceful. Instead of attempting to analyze this lengthy speech, it might be more satisfactory to quote his objections written to John Randolph, Jr., in which he said:

"... it (the bank) has failed to answer the ends for which it was created; and, besides being unconstitutional, in which point of view no measure of utility could ever procure for it my official sanction it is on the score of expediency dangerous to liberty, and therefore worthy of the denunciation which it has received from the disciples of the old Republican school."

It was during this period that the Constitutionality of the bank was most argued. Only once, in 1819, did the bank statute come before the Supreme Court and this was hardly the kind of a test case the bank's opponents would like. There has never been a real suit brought to trial by an individual or group of individuals because of the measures and precautions taken by the bank's supporters. In framing the Federal Reserve Banking Act of 1913 and its subsequent amendments it was provided that only the Attorney General of a State can bring the case into court. This is pretty much like a precaution a burglar takes when he poisons the watch dog. The Attorney General is an appointed office. If he gets too unruly he can be easily removed and another hand-picked for the job. This can be done without too much suspicion or unpleasant publicity because the attorneys specified by law are the Generals of States which are virtually unknown, at least in comparison with the Attorney General of the United States. It would invite suspicion to prohibit altogether a slim possibility of bringing suit against the Act or its administrators, although some agencies which could not stand the light of examination insert clauses which make them immune from investigation—the rotten UNNRA, for example

Prior to 1913 test cases were rejected on the argument that no individual could show where the Banking Acts specifically did damage directly to him personally.

A foreclosure, bankruptcy, and other misfortunes were laid to legitimate business transactions. This would be accepted as the direct cause. There are many court decisions establishing the customer relationship with banking but that is about the extent of customer litigation.

The case of 1819 was brought by a common informer against a cashier of the Baltimore branch of the Bank, for issuing bank notes without paying the tax which Maryland required of any bank not chartered by the State. The questions to be settled were: Had Congress authority to incorporate a bank, had the bank authority to establish a branch in Baltimore without Maryland's consent, had Maryland the right to tax the branch?

Counsel for the Bank maintained that legislative, executive and judicial acts for three decades had treated the first and second banks as lawfully established; that the power to create a bank *"must be considered as ratified by the voice of the people, and sanctioned by precedent."* Counsel for Maryland opposed this convenient doctrine. The Constitution said nothing about chartering a bank or any other corporation, though it did say that Congress might make laws *"necessary and proper"* for carrying into execution the specifically mentioned powers of Congress. No such laws had been made by Congress. To leave such powers as the bank had to interpretation was in effect to render the Constitution worthless.

If the power to establish branch banks belonged to Congress, counsel for Maryland argued:

"it cannot be delegated to the directors of a bank, any more than any legislative power may be transferred to any other body of citizens. Will it be tolerated, that twenty directors of a trading corporation, having no object but profit, shall, in pursuit of it, tread upon the sovereignty of the state, enter it without condescending to ask its leave; disregard, perhaps, the whole system of its policy; overthrow its institutions, and sacrifice its interests?"

Chief Justice John Marshall wrote the decision of the Court. As a long time disciple of the Hamiltonian philosophy of implied powers, it is evident that his decision was colored by his political views. He maintained that such an institution as the branch bank was not prohibited by the Constitution; and that it was consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution and was therefore constitutional. The Court had not passed on the specific features of the National Bank charter; it merely held that the law creating the branch bank was a constitutional exercise of power of Congress. The Court also left an opening to attack the Bank on the grounds of its necessity—an opening which served Jackson well.

This decision really settled nothing as far as the main question of the National charter was concerned. Even if it had, a single verdict could not establish a powerful precedent. The case was most important because of the arguments advanced and the coloring of political

philosophies. The only other case of importance against the Bank was fought before the Supreme Court when the United States sued for a portion of the dividends withheld by the Bank when its charter was not renewed. The United States won over the Banks. Chief Justice Taney, who succeeded Marshall, and is thought by many to be one of the most outstanding of our Chief Justices, was bitterly opposed to the charter on Constitutional grounds, but in the case of the United States against the Bank he withdrew from the bench with judicial propriety because of his earlier official connection with the matter. In recent years the only Justice to make this stand on the monetary issue was Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who said:

"We must break the Money Trust or the Money Trust will break us."

It was with credit and justice that Jackson argued,

"Every act of Congress which attempts by grants of monopolies or sale of exclusive privileges for a limited time, or a time without limit, to restrict or extinguish its own discretion in the choice of means to execute its delegated powers is equivalent to a legislative amendment to the Constitution, and palpably unconstitutional."

Jefferson, the great Democrat, framer of the Declaration of Independence, and intimate with the intentions of the Constitutional Assembly, said:

"The Incorporation of a bank and the powers assumed by this Bill (First Bank of America Bill) have not in my opinion been delegated to the United States by the Constitution. The Bill delivers us up bound to the National Bank, who are free to refuse all arrangements except on their own terms, and the public not free on such refusal, to employ any other bank."

Henry Clay correctly reasoned,

"The power to charter companies is not specified in the grant of powers in the Constitution, and I contend it is of a nature not transferable by mere implication . . . Is it to be imagined that a power so vast would have been left by the wisdom of the Constitution to doubtful inference?"

A few court opinions cited in support of those on the more conservative side of the question are definite and convincing. Those who advocate a monetary policy based on the explicit language of Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the Constitution do not have to dodge fears of unconstitutional and therefore Un-American usurpation, do not have to buy or appoint ... [those] who will find arguments for any side of any question, do

not have to invent means to escape justice in the Courts. It might be profitable to look at a decision or two in support of their views.

The Supreme Court off the United States in the Case of Knox versus Lee and the case of Parker versus Davis held that the government has the right under the Constitution to issue treasury notes as a circulating medium and further holds that it is the duty of the government to issue its treasury notes and supply the demand for a currency when there is a deflation. It made this emphatic declaration:

"It certainly was intended to confer upon Congress the power of self-preservation . . . It is absolutely essential to independent national existence that the government should have a firm hold on the two great sovereign instrumentalities of the sword and the purse, and to wield them without restrictions on occasions of national peril."

If America is to preserve her liberties and perpetuate her government, her citizens must understand that the government and the government alone must control both of these instrumentalities, namely, the circulating medium as well as the army and navy. The Supreme Court of the United States said so.

In another case the private bankers tried to destroy United States Notes. The Supreme Court ruling on a private individuals refusal to accept these notes in payment of a private debt declared:

"Congress has the Constitutional power to make the Treasury Notes of the United States a legal tender in payment of private debts in time of peace as well as in times of war . . . Congress has the undoubted right to make currency lawful money for all purposes. Congress may make paper currency lawful money for all purposes. Congress may make paper currency legal tender for all debts, present and future."

This Supreme Court decision has never been challenged in any manner whatsoever and stands today as a valid interpretation of the law of the United States.

Concerning the unconstitutionality of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 much can be said. If Congress does not coin our money and regulate its value, the system of coinage and regulation thereof is unconstitutional. But Congress does not coin our money and regulate its value. Therefore, our system of coinage and regulation thereof is unconstitutional.

A look into the system itself penetrates to the truth of this fact even though it must burrow through many stratas of lying propaganda. In the first place these banks are privately owned stock corporations. And the government does not own any of the

stock! Since the surplus of a corporation goes to the stockholders, the government is left begging its crumb from the tables of the money changers.

Furthermore, Congress does not appoint the governors of the Federal Reserve Board as is directed by the Constitution. They are appointed by the President. Congress does not even approve of their appointment. Only the Senate by a majority vote does the approving, while the House of Representatives which contains 435 members more directly responsible to the people, have no say whatsoever. The constitutional grant is to both houses, not one.

Nor does the government pay any salaries to the members of the Federal Reserve Board. The government thereby tacitly admits it is appointing men to private stock corporations and logically enough concludes that it is but just that these corporations should pay the salaries of these men. If the members of the Board were working for the government, anyone with an ounce of brains knows the government would pay them for their services. If, on the other hand, they are not being paid by the government, we reasonably conclude they are not working for the government.

The most important indictment against the contention that the Government in some way owns and operates the "Federal" Reserve Banks is the incontrovertible fact that Congress gives them neither a mandate nor a list of specific duties, both of which are necessary if the government is to operate the banks. Congress does not even demand that the Board establish price levels which is of primary importance if any money system is to have anything like efficiency or stability. This fundamental duty is not imposed by Congress. Nor is any other. Congress fixes duties for the army, navy and Post Office officials it appoints, and sees to it that these men fulfill their duties for the welfare of the nation.

The Federal Reserve carries on its functions solely for private profits. Not only does the surplus of the banking corporations go to the stockholders of the corporations, but through the manipulation of price levels, the interchanging of the quantity of gold from one nation to another, the domination of markets, and the like, these men earn illicit profits from other sources such as public utilities, which they are able to control through their control of money.

The mildest conclusion one can draw from these facts is that our present money system is an unconstitutional institution detrimental to the functions of the American government and the interests of the American people.

Other arguments in brief run as follows. No institution whose stock is partly owned by foreign interests is American. Since the stock of the present banking system is partly owned by foreign interests it cannot be said to be American.

Any institution whose functions are hostile to the general welfare is unconstitutional. But the functions of the Federal Reserve System are hostile to the general welfare and are therefore unconstitutional. That their functions are hostile to the general welfare is seen in their cycles of inflation (prosperity) and deflation (depression), in the wars, and want in

the midst of plenty. We know it is hostile to the general welfare from the knowledge of the principles of the persons composing its directors and many of its stockholders; from their opposition to the measures and principles of sound government and their support to those friendly to their interests; and from sentiments of publications they support.

The Constitution provides for an honest and efficient monetary system. But since the system is run by a privileged few who substitute private money for money coined by Congress, the system is not honest and efficient, and therefore unconstitutional.

The framers of the Constitution were just and learned men. But it is not just for a certain few to issue private money for honest public money, and if they were learned they did not intend for only part of the money to be issued by Congress or they would have said so. Thus, if the framers of the Constitution were just and learned they did not intend such a monstrosity as the present system.

Any power not granted by the Constitution is unconstitutional. But the power of private individuals issuing private money for private gain is not granted by the Constitution and is, therefore, unconstitutional.

The Constitution states that Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate its value. But when that power is given to private individuals, Congress does not have it. Hence, it is unconstitutional for private individuals to have this power.

Concerning the delegation of this power by Congress it must be noted that the Constitution is itself a delegation of power from its sovereign source, the people. Therefore, for Congress to delegate this power is in fact a sub-delegation, and according to the rules of delegation and sub-delegation the latter cannot be done without the permission of the original source in this case the people. No one has ever claimed that the people voted this power to their super-citizens.

The Constitution does not say that Congress may have the power to coin money and regulate its value. It says Congress shall have this power. The language is not one of mere permission. It is a definite and exclusive grant. Since the Constitution grants this right to Congress it was granted for Congress to exercise, not to give away. It is an absolute right, not a privilege to be given to any other group.

Not even the States have the right to coin and regulate money. (Article I, Section 10, Paragraph 1.) If the individual States cannot exercise this power according to the Constitution, how much more repulsive it is to the Constitution to have a mere handful of private citizens performing this sovereign right!

If the government does not issue and control its own money, it must be controlled by those who do. To have a few of its citizens controlling the government is completely foreign to the very purposes of the Constitution and therefore definitely unconstitutional

The Constitution not only gives Congress the right to coin money, but “to regulate the value thereof.” Since the private banks, by expanding and contracting credit at will, regulate the value thereof by changing the amount in existence, the system is plainly unconstitutional on this score. By regulating the value of money Congress was to control the purchasing power of the nation, thereby preventing the tremendous fluctuations by which a few international bankers can and do inflict sufferings without limit or justification and have inflicted without measure or accounting.

In fact, no authority was ever delegated to Congress or to anyone else to tax Americans for the benefit of any foreign people or government. Yet this is done annually under the pressure of private bankers. Every cent of these foreign loans must be paid for by the American taxpayer. It is not only expended unlawfully, but every person party to it is guilty of misfeasance and subject to recovery from the highest to the lowest of such officials. Taxpayers suits in the courts of the land to save America from the international loan sharks are definitely in order. But try to get one in court!

The extent to which the present Federal Reserve System vitiates the purposes and intentions of the original authors of the Bill enacting the system into law, is evident in a decision of Robert L. Owen, co-author of the Bill. Owen later volunteered his services gratis for the purpose of fighting the constitutionality of the Federal Reserve Act before the Supreme Court of the United States if and when a test case could be presented.

President Jackson on sovereignty and grant of power in his first inaugural address spoke the following bit of irrefutable logic:

“The great point to be kept steadily in view is the establishment of the General Government and the Sovereign Powers granted to it by the people and the states.

1. All sovereign power was in the people and the States.

2. Where sovereignty is vested it cannot be divested but by express grant, therefore, as the General Government is based upon the Confederation of the sovereign states, you must look into the Constitution for the grants of sovereignty made by the people inhabiting those sovereign states to find what portion of sovereign power has been granted to the General Government; for, no sovereign power not expressly granted can be exercised by implication.

Is the sovereign power to grant corporations expressly given to the General Government to be found in the Constitution? I answer, no. Therefore, as all powers granted are general and national, not local, or for local objects, and all powers not delegated are retained to the States and to the people, a corpo-

ration or monopoly cannot be granted by Congress beyond the limits of the ten square miles, and it is fair to advert to the Journal of the Constitutional Convention to prove that the power to grant corporations in various ways was attempted to be introduced in the Constitution, and was rejected in every form presented by the Constitutional Convention who framed it.

It is therefore, worse than idle to contend that Congress can have this sovereign power by implication when it was rejected in the convention, and when sovereign power can only be conveyed from one power to another by express grant.

If it is true that necessity gives the power to create Banks and corporations, it is true necessity creates its own law, but it must be a positive necessity, not a feigned one. The framers of our Constitution were too well aware of the corrupting influences of a great monied monopoly upon government to legalize such a corrupting monster by any grant either express or implied in the Constitution.

Bank corporations are brokers on a large scale, and could it be really urged that the framers of the Constitution intended that our Government should become a Government of brokers? If so, then the profits of the National Brokers Shop must ensure to the benefit of the whole people, and not to a few privileged monied capitalists, to utter rejection of the many."

Democratic party men and women of the present day are meeting at Jefferson and Jackson Day dinners all over the country and some of their top men are making speeches. Several million citizens are expected to vote the democratic ticket in 1950 and '52. For the information of the rank and file, it would be less hypocritical for some of these speakers to tell the voters, on whom they must depend, why no mention is made off the issue that lay closer to the hearts of these two great patriots, Jefferson and Jackson, than all others. Their predictions of the dire consequences which would result to this nation if it failed to take over the issuance of money have been thoroughly vindicated. America is now suffering as she never has before because of the failure of past congresses and presidents to take over the issuance of money. The condition of the country is such that many of her thoughtful citizens fear that her very existence is threatened on account of that failure. Then why have banquets to honor these great patriots and refuse to do what they said should be done?

The Republican Party also has its Lincoln dinners where their orators laud the virtues of Lincoln. And why are these speakers silent about this great issue, the issue which was closest to Lincoln's heart and which, on account of his efforts to restore money issuance to the government he doubtless lost his life to an assassin?

What strange influence is it that stops the mouths of both Democrats and Republicans from advocacy of the one measure which would give to the people greatest relief, which would save this country? All the parties in their conventions will shy away from this all important question. There will be no candidate big enough and brave enough to come forward and champion the rights of the people in this matter. It has come to pass that the vital interests of the rank and file are completely ignored by our political parties.

Chapter IV

Bonds and Bondage

“Under this roof are the heads of the family of Rothschild, a name famous in every capital in Europe and every division of the globe. If you like we shall divide the United States into two parts, one for you, James, and one for you, Lionel. Napoleon will do exactly and all that I shall advise him, and to Bismarck will be suggested such an intoxicating program as to make him our abject slave.”

That was part of a speech made by Disraeli at the marriage of Lenora Rothschild, daughter of Lionel, to her cousin, Alfonso of Paris. One is tempted to dwell at length on the tragic lessons of such audacity. Let it suffice, however, to accept the startling evidence of increased Rothschild greed and the domination of national leaders by bankers’ whims. When they could control two of the most powerful characters in all European history, Napoleon and Bismarck, it is not even mildly surprising, even if tediously exasperating, to see them govern such a pint-sized Napoleon, carbon-copy Bismarck as our late war President.

The Bank was defeated when America’s singular *Democrat*, Andrew Jackson, defeated its schemes for a renewed charter. Why then did conditions become worse than under the charter? Why did the nation go back into the clutches of international finance if they once managed to get free from them? Apologists for the money trust make the most of these questions.

The plain historical fact is that the internationalist bankers were responsible for the difficult times which followed and grabbed the nation back into their grasp against the will and interests of the nation. In explanation of this answer to the questions, three facts stand out:

1. Without a national charter the banks simply took out state charters in the states where they had been operating. That was the principal if not only difference. They kept their same old illegal powers, their same directors and same philosophy of conduct.

2. The Banks maliciously and with deliberation contracted credit in order to make times exceedingly difficult. They spread a flood of propaganda concerning Jackson’s alleged “wild-cat finance” and blamed Old Hickory for the misery they caused with the intention of either forcing his capitulation or the election of a man of their choice. It’s an old trick, a veritable ace up the sleeve. It was used against Franklin D. Roosevelt after he first proposed to “drive the money changers from the temple.” Unfortunately, he was no Jackson.

3. The Government did not take over its *Constitutional duty* of coining and regulating its money but left that all-important function with the banks. The entire effort of Jackson and his followers was so bent and spent in destroying the Bank that a well-designed plan for sound and honest operation was not formulated. Several such plans are now in readiness.

From this time on, loans to build up the country were absolutely necessary. The South and the West were in the making and had to go deeply in debt. When an establishment is in the process of erection it is not as yet self-supporting. These loans were obtained from England through the Bank of New York. One reason the New York Bank was used instead of a bank nearer the South or West was because the Northern firm had easy access to London. The lack of roads in the other territories was an added hindrance. But the main reason is found in the fact that the large number of people who did business with the New York Bank made safe the risk of having enough people demand cash to break the small dependent Southern and Western banks. This would leave the Northern banks the big power in the United States. Since ten percent of the money was real money and the other ninety percent man-made credit (same proportion used by the goldsmiths of old), according to the system every dollar drawn would cut off ten dollars of operating money. Thus a relatively small percentage of New York's multitudes could easily draw out enough money to break the new banks of the growing territories.

The new sections of the country saw when they began to produce they were unreasonably hampered by a foreign money power. They protested at the polls, and because four men were running for the Presidency, Lincoln managed to get elected on only forty percent of the popular vote. The industrial North did not like the cheap slave labor with which the South and West provided their raw materials. The resentment of the South was played upon by agents of foreign bankers. She began to secede from the Union, and finally went to war.

Basically, the Civil War was not fought to free the Negro at all. Slavery was already on its way out. This country was probably the last of the modern countries to eradicate it and the issue would have had to be met anyway. The war was really fought to bring America firmly into the possession of the Rothschilds, famous rulers of international finance. The Northern banks were still able to function as independent units. No small group could yet sit down and dictate the functions of the nation.

Bismarck told the story in 1876:

"The division of the United States into two federations of equal force was decided long before the Civil war by the High Financial Power of Europe. These bankers were afraid the United States, if they remained in one block and as one nation, would attain economical and financial independence, which would upset their financial domination over the world. The voice of the Rothschilds predominated. They foresaw tremendous booty if they could substitute two feeble democracies, indebted to the ... financiers, to the vigorous Republic, confident and self providing. Therefore, they started their emissaries in order to exploit the question of slavery and thus to dig an abyss between the two parts of the Republic."

To show that the real story of the Civil War was known, even in Europe, let's continue with Bismarck's narration:

"Lincoln never suspected these underground machinations. He was anti-slaverist, and he was elected as such. But his character prevented him from being the man of one party. When he had affairs in his hands, he perceived that these sinister financiers of Europe, the Rothschilds, wished to make him the executor of their designs. They made the rupture between the North and the South imminent! The master of finance in Europe made this rupture definitive in order to exploit it to the utmost.

Lincoln's personality surprised them. His candidature did not trouble them; they thought to easily dupe the candidate woodcutter. But Lincoln read their plots and soon understood that the South was not the worst foe, but the ... financiers. He did not confide his apprehensions, he watched the gestures of the Hidden Hand; he did not wish to expose publicly the questions which would disconcert the ignorant masses.

Lincoln decided to eliminate the international banker by establishing a system of loans, allowing the States to borrow directly from the people without intermediary. He did not study financial questions, but his robust good sense revealed to him, that the source of any wealth resides in the work and economy of the nation. He opposed emissions through the international financiers. He obtained from Congress the right to borrow from the people by selling to it the bonds of the States. The local banks were only too glad to help such a system. And the Government and the nation escaped the plots of the foreign financiers."

To the House of Commons committee on banking and commerce Gerald M. McGeer, K.C., Vancouver lawyer, about 1935 during a long attack on the present financial system, said:

"The evidence discloses that instead of being a patriot, John Wilkes Booth, who assassinated Lincoln in a Washington theater, was a mercenary."

Basing his beliefs upon an exhaustive study of unexpurgated copies of the evidence given by secret service agents at Booth's trial, he declared the only group that could benefit by Lincoln's death and who had the money to carry out such a plan was the international bankers.

"The South respected Lincoln and looked upon him as the only one who would secure them justice in defeat. If they wished to kill him they had splendid opportunities and could have secured a thousand who would do the job,"

Mr. McGeer said,

"Lincoln was wont to describe the men opposing his greenback currency policy as 'the secret foes of the nation'. The battle between Lincoln and the sound money men of the day was well known. In 1864 he was elected on a platform that contained a plank declaring for national currency.

Lincoln was the most powerful reformer of his day. Had he lived he would have established a national currency system in the United States. There was only one group in the world at the time who could finance anything they cared to attempt without regard to cost, and who had any reason to desire the death of Lincoln. They were the men opposed to his national currency program and who had fought him throughout the whole Civil War on his policy of greenback currency. They were the men interested in the establishment of the gold standard system and the right of the bankers to manage the currency and credit for every nation in the world.

With Lincoln out of the way they were able to proceed with that plan and did proceed with it in the United States. Within eight years after Lincoln's assassination silver was demonetized and the gold standard money system set up in the United States."

The President and his Secretary of the Treasury heatedly refused the money kings who wanted 24 percent to 36 percent interest for loans to our Government to conduct the Civil War, stating the terms were outrageously unpatriotic. The money-lenders are said to have replied: *"If the Government didn't want the money at that figure, they would loan it to the Southern Confederacy"* which they did.

Writing in his book, *"Twenty Years of Congress,"* and reviewing the period of the Civil War, James G. Blaine said:

"We were engaged, therefore, in a threefold contest – a military one with the Confederacy, a diplomatic and a moral one with the Governments of England and France, a financial one with the money powers of Europe."

The inner sanctums of finance had rejoiced at the prospects of a Civil War. Their hearts steeled, their thirst for greed became insatiable. Human life was no longer sacred; the shrill of war trumpets became the sweetest of music. Why? Because they so sincerely loved the dusky descendants of Shem toiling in the cotton fields? Because their noble instincts rebelled against the cruelty of slavery? Because they were inspired to a holy crusade upon reading a little book called *"Uncle Tom's Cabin?"* Hardly! They knew

their opportunity to obtain possession of the national finances was at hand! They began to make preparations immediately upon Lincoln's election.

As soon as Lincoln called for volunteers the gold and silver money of the nation disappeared as it always has when the country, in its darkest hour, its hour of peril, its time of greatest need, required this money in a vastly increased volume. When the president called for a half million volunteers for three years the real situation became apparent and the ranks were soon filled. These men had to be clothed, fed and equipped. Just when these requirements demanded huge sums of money, the treasury was emptied of its gold and silver. Lincoln had the duty of suppressing rebellion, opposing aggression of national enemies and defending the liberties of the nation entrusted to his care. *He had to have the money.*

The bankers who wanted war and so vehemently protested the secession of the slave states could be expected to come to the rescue by pouring out its treasures in defense of the government. Justice and patriotism would have prompted this course of action, but history tells what it told before and since, namely, that the bankers have *no patriotism, no sense of justice*. The foreign banks would not loan the North money under any circumstances because they wanted the spoils of a rich country after she had been torn in two bloody, feeble mires of helplessness. American financiers graciously agreed to loan their notes at 24 to 36 percent discount, or, in other words, would exchange less than eighty dollars of their notes for one hundred dollars in perfectly good government bonds, bearing a high rate of interest, and payable in gold backed by the government.

Lincoln refused such oppressive, outrageous terms. He knew the Constitution provision for governmental coining of money. He knew that if a piece of printed paper called a bond could circulate as money, a similar piece of printed paper called a dollar-could also circulate as money. With Congressional approval he issued sixty million dollars worth of demand notes, maliciously labeled "greenbacks" by the frustrated money men. This was in reality the first and last truly government money issued in America. About 346 million dollars are still in use. Bearing no interest at the point of issue they have saved the American taxpayers in unearned tribute to the bankers several times the amount of the original sum. That means the money sharks were justly beaten out of that much money and the public benefited correspondingly. These notes were made full legal tender for all debts, private and public, and were on a par with gold.

Representative White graphically impressed this point in testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee in the middle of 1946 when he explained:

"I have in my hand a well-worn dollar that was minted in 1879 ...I asked the Federal Reserve to check on it and calculate the interest saved by that old dollar, and I have the information here with me. It amounts to about \$44.

That old worn dollar has saved the American people, in circulating interest-free, more than twice its weight in gold...

I mean, if it had been a Federal Reserve dollar, it would have had to have been supported by Government bonds or commercial loans called eligible paper ...I mean it saved the people \$44, and I do not believe any sophistry can change that fact...

The thing that was saved was the item of interest ...\$44 they (the people) would otherwise have paid to the banks."

The issuance of this money at once brought relief to the country. With an abundance of money, not even the blight of war could check the prosperity of the country. Not only was the soldier paid for his services and all his necessary equipment paid for, but commerce, industry and education received a new impetus. The *Shylocks* were thrown into consternation. Their scheme to rob the people through exorbitant rates of interest failed, but it did not find them so sullen and dissonant that they were unable to plot further. They admitted that such a policy would enable Americans "to carry on their own commerce and become prosperous beyond any precedent in the history of civilized nations." That would be a calamity! Someone besides the *Shylocks* would prosper – but not if they could prevent it!

Only four days after the passage of the Legal Tender Act to supply the country with government money, a bankers convention was held in Washington consisting of four delegates from New York banks, three 'from Philadelphia, and three from Boston. They were alarmed because the legal tender act was the friend of the people and would transfer the monopoly of money from their hands to the government where it constitutionally belonged. They saw in it a precedent which, if established, would forever after enable the government to relieve itself and the people without submitting to usurious extortions. Nor would the government, supplied with its own money, have any occasion to call their hoarded gold from its hiding place. At their convention the Bankers realized they must again get control of Congress and devise some means by which the demand for their gold would become imperative. Their conspiracy reached perfection when the infamous exception clause on the greenbacks was pushed through Congress in February of 1862 on the recommendation of Secretary of Treasury Chase, with whom the delegates earnestly consulted and reached the desired agreement. According to their clause the greenbacks should be legal tender for all debts public and private "except duties on imports and interest on the public debt."

From that time forward interest and duties had to be paid in coin, thereby creating a demand for their useless gold. This meant that, when an importer, for example, who received a cargo of goods from abroad went to pay duty on his greenbacks, he was told that the government would not receive these greenbacks – its own money – but that payment

must be made in gold. *This amounted to the government discrediting its own obligation.* When the importer went to the gold-hoarding money changer to exchange his greenback for gold, he found the money sharks selling this gold at a handsome profit. Many of the greenbacks containing this exemption clause later sold for forty cents on the dollar.

The final demise of the greenback was sealed in an enactment of April, 1866, which provided for a regular and systematic cremation of the sound and honest governmental issue of its only real money. Lincoln 'foresaw what this banker inspired clause would do to his greenbacks for he said,

"It is extremely doubtful whether a circulation of United States Notes payable in coin and sufficiently large for the wants of the people can be permanently, usefully and safely maintained."

Lincoln, who had suffered most of his life because of debts, did not want the government to go in debt to financial tycoons as the only means of supplying the nation with sufficient amounts of circulating medium to carry on the conduct of its affairs. It is evident that Lincoln wanted not only to free the black men but he also wanted the white man to be free as well.

The international bankers from abroad betrayed selfish interests in the supposedly purely American problem of slavery from the beginning of the conflict. In 1862 the creditors of America, the Bank of England, sent the following circular to every bank in New York and New England:

"Slavery is likely to be abolished by the war power. This, I and my European friends are in favor of, for slavery is but the owning of labor and carries with it the care of the laborer, while the European plan, led on by England, is for capital to control labor by controlling the wages. This can be done by controlling the money. The great debt that capitalists will see to it is made out of the war must be used as a means to control the volume of money. To accomplish this, the bonds must be used as a banking basis. We are now waiting for the Secretary of the Treasury to make the recommendations to Congress. It will not do to allow the greenback, as it is called, to circulate any length of time, as we cannot control that."

Another of their circulars said in part:

"To restore to circulation the Government issue of money will provide the people with money and will therefore seriously affect your individual profit as bankers and lenders."

Still another circular issued from New York read:

"The interests of national bankers require immediate legislation by Congress. Silver, silver certificates, and Treasury notes must be retired, and national bank notes upon a gold basis made the only money. . . . You will at once retire one-third of your circulation and call in one-half of your loans. Be careful to make a money stringency felt among your patrons, especially among influential business men...."

The London Times wrote with puppet-like fidelity:

"If that mischievous financial policy, which had its origin in the North American Republic during the late war in that country, should become indurated down to a fixture, then that Government will furnish its own money without cost. It will pay off its debts and be without a debt. It will have all the money necessary to carry on its commerce. It will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilized governments of the world. The brains and wealth of all countries will go to North America. That government must be destroyed or it will destroy every monarchy on the globe."

Lincoln knew of their plot. He was worried because the delegates who engineered the exception clause accused him of wrecking the country, that he had cheapened money by his issuance. Yet he could see from the results that he had saved the country and that the only money cheapened was the private bank money. He is reported to have said:

"I am worse off than St. Paul. He was in a strait between two. I am in a strait between twenty, and they are bankers and financiers."

He had the precedent of Jefferson and the other enlightened greats of American history. The private money system had failed as it did later in wars under Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. How much more pleasant would be the task of writing the recent history of America, how much more heartening for the suffering world, if these men had been other Lincolns!

Honest Abe issued Constitutional money to meet the needs of the nation, freed the government from the usurious usurpations of private finance rackets, and allowed the country to prosper without profit to the bankers and without disaster to the taxpayers. He was determined not to let Democracy become an oligarchy by turning it over to private financial interests because he knew that the survival of Democracy depended upon the right of the people to regulate the money changers for the progress, prosperity and peace of the nation. Americans would be astonished at the voluminous scope of Lincoln's words and work on the monetary question.

The Civil War, as wars were made to do, played a part in the diabolical scheme of high finance. Wars are used to saddle the government with heavy interest-bearing debts

(bonds) just as they have since the Rothschild dynasty first developed the international racket of manipulating credit during the Napoleonic Wars. The circulars quoted above specifically outlined the policy they used at that time, have used since, and are using now.

Quoting from "The Conquest of Poverty" by Gerald G. McGeer, Dwinell writes:

"Clearly recognizing that if Lincoln succeeded in the United States that the power of high finance would be wiped out throughout the world, for the international bankers knew that other nations would be certain to follow Lincoln's lead, the bankers of Europe and England organized against Lincoln and exhorted the bankers of the United States to support.

This program of the organized international bankers constituted a direct challenge to Lincoln, who incurred the hatred and undying enmity of this crafty and merciless band of robbers when he undertook to establish the right of the Government of the American people to save the nation from disruption by the issue of national currency not convertible into either gold or silver."

France and especially England aided the South in the conflict. This was natural in view of the fact these countries were headquarters for the internationalists. If they should subdue the North they would have the entire country because the South would be taken over in the process. Judah P. Benjamin was chosen by the Rothschilds to do their work in the South. Benjamin was the first adviser to Jeff Davis, President of the Southern Confederacy, and later became Secretary of State under Davis. Benjamin has with much justification been called the brains of the revolt.

It is a little known fact that England landed troops at the Mexican border and was prevented from sending them to the aid of the South, to whom she was giving money and war materials, only the action of Czar Alexander II of Russia, who had learned of the plan from his ambassadors in London and Paris. The Czar told England that if she sent those troops into American territory she could consider herself at war with Russia. To take care of that eventuality the friendly Czar sent a fleet to San Francisco under the command of Admiral S. Lesowsky and another to New York under the command of Admiral Popoff. Both commanders were to take orders only from Lincoln. The interest of the Russian ruler was reasonable. Not only had England persistently blocked Russia's efforts to obtain a port on the Black Sea, but the rich wheat fields of Russia were next on the list of Rothschild conquests, conquests which were already extending to every part of the world.

Czar Alexander was murdered in 1881 after many previous attempts had been frustrated. Lincoln was killed in 1865. In the trunk of John Wilkes Booth, Lincoln's assassin, were found coded messages the key to which was found in the possession of Judah P. Benjamin, Rothschild's agent to the South and Secretary of State in the Southern Confederacy.

Lincoln had driven the “Ragmen,” as he called the bankers, from the temple of the American government. It was by this action that he sealed his personal doom. In this gigantic contest, little referred to by historians, the “great Emancipator” was assassinated by the “secret foes of the nation.” As Bismarck truly said:

“They (foreign financiers) understood at once, that the United States would escape their grip (through Lincoln’s method of finance). The death of Lincoln was resolved upon. Nothing is easier than to find a fanatic to strike.”

When the Northern forces emerged victoriously, James Rothschild was left without Mexico and the Southern States and his brother Lionel was without capturing the North, as they had planned. However, through the establishment of the National Banking Act during the war, their houses exercised a lion’s share of power over the nation.

The State Banks were established. The problem now was to get them into a unified national system for easier control. John Sherman, hatchet man for the internationalists, knew that these newly-proposed National Banks would have almost complete control of the nation’s finances and added in a letter to the Rothschild brothers:

“The few who can understand the system will either be so interested in its profits or so dependent on its favors, that there will be no opposition from that class, while on the other hand, the great body of the people . . . will bear its burdens without complaint, and perhaps, without even suspecting the system is inimical to their interests.”

A letter written by the Rothschild brothers to their branch in Wall Street is interesting, not only for the international aspect of the plot, but because of the greed and indifference to the fortune of the American people. The letter is as follows:

*London, June 25, 1863
Messrs. Ikleheimer, Morton and Vandergould,
No. 3 Wall Street, New York, U.S.A.*

“Dear Sirs:

A Mr. John Sherman has written us from a town in Ohio, U.S.A. as to the profits that may be made in the National Banking business under a recent act of your Congress, a copy of which act accompanied his letter. Apparently this act has been drawn upon the plan formulated here last summer by British Banker’s Association and by that Association recommended to our American friends as one that if enacted into law, would prove highly profitable to the banking fraternity throughout the world.

Mr. Sherman declares that there has never before been such an opportunity for capitalists to accumulate money, as to that presented by this act and that the old plan, of State Banks is so unpopular that the new scheme will, by mere contrast, be most favorably regarded notwithstanding the fact that it gives the National Banks an almost absolute control of the National finances. "The few who can understand the system," he said, "will either be so interested in its profits, or so dependent on its favors, that there will be no opposition from that class, while on the other hand, the great body of the people mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantages that capital derives from the system, will bear its burdens without complaint, and perhaps, without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests.

Please advise us fully as to this matter, and also state whether or not you will be of assistance to us, if we conclude to establish a National Bank in the City of New York. If you are acquainted with Mr. Sherman (he appears to have introduced the National Banking Act), we will be glad to know something of him. If we avail ourselves of the information he furnished, we will of course make due compensation. Awaiting your reply we are

Your respectful servants,

Rothschild Brothers"

The National Bank Act engineered by John Sherman and Secretary Chase was presented under the plausible guise as "a device to get money to run the war (Civil War) and a method to achieve stability in currency and finance." It was deliberately sneaked through a diverted Congress with only a three or four day pause before the Senate and only two days before the House. Congress was not aware of the real nature of the bill as documentary evidence proves. The bill did not go through the regular procedure of Committee hearings but was high pressured through and won by a mere majority of one vote in the Senate and by six in the House.

The international bankers were now successful in establishing a private central bank in America. They were now able to manipulate the entire money system of the solid and prospering nation. The former State Banks had the power to create money but were for practical purposes independent units. But now a small group could meet and decide the financial policies of America. They worked hand in glove with the Bank of England.

In writing of the National Bank Act, Horace Greely aptly observed:

"We have stricken the shackles from four million human beings and brought all laborers to a common level, not so much by the elevation of the former

slaves as by practically reducing the whole working population, white and black, to a condition of serfdom. While boasting of our noble deeds, we are careful to conceal the ugly fact that by our iniquitous money system we have nationalized a system of oppression which, though more refined, is not less cruel than the old system of chattel slavery."

From "Real Money versus False Money" by T. Cushing Daniel, Dwinell quotes the following:

"Here begins one of the darkest chapters in American history. It will be found that every step taken by Congress from this on, in matters pertaining to the finances of the nation, has been dictated by the money power. Foreign capitalists, such as the Rothschilds, became deeply interested in the scheme of robbery inaugurated by the passage of this Act, and through their agents, such as August Belmont, banker and . . . chairman of the Democratic National Committee, have aided the money power here materially in controlling the policy of both the great political parties.... This Bill changed the whole currency system of this country and transferred the sovereign right of the Government 'to issue money' to Banking Corporations organized for private gain. Thus, we see the vicious principle of the two so-called United States Banks perpetuated."

Not even a New Deal Attorney General could read this evidence and fail to recognize that this National Bank was dominated by foreign financiers, set up by dishonest means for the one purpose of robbing the American public for their own selfish gains. Not only have the halls of Congress been stuffed with timeserving legislators who act in behalf of the *de facto* banker-government to the detriment of the *de jure* government of the United States of America. It is not to be wondered at that nearly every governmental bureau of appointed commission features bankers—even if it be the chairmanship of the National Red Cross.

Bankers often reach the floors of the House in spite of a law introduced in 1793 because of the fear our founding fathers had of the prejudiced bankers' influence on national legislation, and signed by George Washington. This law read:

"Any person holding any office or any stock in any institution in the nature of a bank for issuing or discounting bills or notes payable to bearer or order, cannot be a member of the House whilst he holds such office or stock."

The author cannot find that this law was ever repealed and does not expect the delightful surprise of discovering a single instance of its enforcement.

Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury under Lincoln, was in fact one of Lincoln's worst enemies, despising him as incapable, inferior to himself and hoping to take Lincoln's place as president. Nevertheless, he had the grace to confess in later years:

"My agency in promoting of the National Banking Act was the greatest financial mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly which affects every interest in the Country. It should be repealed, but before that can be accomplished, the people will be arrayed on one side and the banks on the other, in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country."

The law remained and emergency amendments brought the government of the United States to its rescue every time its vicious policy led to the inevitable "periodical pernicious monetary anemia" which would go so far as to find banks refusing to cash their customers' checks. The issue of money by these banks was finally secured by "bonds of the United States and other securities." What these "other securities" are is not told, but that any of them should be United States bonds is ridiculous, for then we have the government, which has everything, going to the banks which have nothing, giving its own credit to the banks so that the banks can give the government some money.

The sea of Demosthenes golden eloquence might be able to do justice to such a monstrous circumstance, but it could not be expected to cover the added absurdity wherein the government pays interest on its own credit while issuing it tax free. A parallel case would be found in a man who owned a large ranch going to a tramp who had nothing, renting the ranch to the tramp so he could have a few of his own beef steaks, and paying the tramp for his labor while charging no rent for the ranch. The man who would do this would rightly be called an *idiot*. Is it not equally reasonable to call the present policy, first put into practice by this National Banking Act, idiotic?

Grant was elected on the Credit Strengthening Act—another one of the bankers' smooth sounding names for their deeds too black to dare to be known among men and which takes its toll of \$600-million from the nation's workers. August Belmont, International Banker and national chairman of the Democratic Party had his instructions from Baron Rothschild from London that, *"Unless the Democratic Party went for paying the Five-Twenty Bonds in gold it must be defeated."* This could put him in good position to turn things to make the Democrats lose to the man who would best serve his and his boss Rothschild's interest.

Since a banker is a banker and since "business is business" one would have to be very simpleminded to believe that a man in a business violating the most fundamental law of the United States, the Constitution, could be concerned with Party fidelity. Country, God, Humanity cannot count with bankers. Their business is unlawful; it reacts on their soul, deadening every finer power of the mind. Belmont the banker, chairman of Democratic Commit-

tee, could not control his Party at their convention. Seymour, the patriot, opposing this so-called Credit Strengthening Act which meant to pay off in coin the currency obligations of the Government—that is the bonds bought for from thirty-five to sixty cents on the dollar, was to be paid off in coin one hundred cents on the dollar. Rothschild's bank held hundreds of millions of dollars of five-twenty bonds and wanted the man who would agree to pay these in gold to be elected. Thus Seymour, the Democratic nominee, was defeated.

Now Grant gyrated and philosophized—*“No repudiator of one farthing of the public debt will be trusted in place.”* Grant meant by “repudiator” citizens who opposed paying the bondholders in gold what was contracted in paper. The noblest citizens were the ones opposed to bogging the Nation in more debt, issuing more bonds to buy gold to pay off bonds bought with paper money—nice trick to skin American taxpayers of hundreds of millions more—*“More bonds more debt; more debt—more bonds”* endless chain for bankers' benefit. What Disraeli said in 1875 is of particular interest:

“The World is governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.”

It was about this period when the Chief Justice of England said:

“The issue that has swept down the centuries and which will have to be fought sooner or later is the People versus the Banks.”

It would be supposed by almost anyone that, with a set-up like this, the international bankers would turn all their efforts toward making profitable business deals under the system. But the lust of power seems to be insatiable when it obsesses the human soul. They were not yet satisfied. The Rothschilds wanted gold to be the only base on which money would be issued. This was desirable on their part because England had but little silver and much gold. Since the United States had much silver and little gold something would have to be done about her. Under Franklin Roosevelt a little secret conference would probably have had F. D. R. announcing to reporters that henceforth America would base its money on gold because *“vast benefits that would come to America in world commerce, especially with Britain,”* or some other cleverly disguised lie. But in those days it was not yet a crime for Americans to be Americans instead of Internationalists, One-Worlders, Union Now enthusiasts, or any other advocates of an excuse to sell out American interests to foreign debt-welching ingrates.

There was a time when Americans were Americans. Any bleeding-heart globalist who wanted to tear down the Stars and Stripes and put up a mongrel rag would have been justly regarded as a traitor. Now it is the first essential for political supremacy. If anyone professes now to be for America first, he is labeled as subversive by one means or another. It

was not so in those days. Presidents were politicians, it is true, but for America, first. What estimation would the great presidents of history have concerning the loyalty and wisdom of America's late presidents who would rather ration American consumption than they would ration European consumption? What would they now think of that great office which is now reduced to the role of seconding the motion of ignoble powers?

The necessary steps to put Americans in slavery have, by their nature, left records by which we can now retrace their nefarious plots, just as we can from Colonial times to World War I, after which blood-letting most of the actions so vitally affecting Americans, their homes, lives, fortunes, wars and peace in the world in which they live, are forever hidden from the possibility of profiting from them.

America was, because of the comparative quantity of the metals, monetizing much silver and little gold. So that had to be stopped, not by giving America more gold money, but by taking her silver money away from her. It was as simple as sneaking another law over on her. The honorable Rothschilds were not too far above a thing like that; after all, they had once kidnapped soldiers to fight for dear old England.

The plot was simply in the matter of law and manner of getting it passed. They sent a harmless looking Bill, "A Bill to Reform Coinage and Mint Laws." to the banking committees of Congress in 1873. Reference to reforming coinage and mint laws is as innocent in appearance as it was supposed to be, the real purpose being hidden in an excess of clever verbage Ernest Seyd, a representative of the Bank of England; was sent over with \$500,000 to bribe the members of the committees and thus have the Bill reported favorably to the floors of the Senate and the House. According to information given under oath, Seyd paid the money and stayed in America until he knew the measure would pass.

At first they were balked because there was one honest man on the Banking Committee who could not be bought. Said he:

"It would be well for the government to increase rather than discontinue the coinage of silver... Its (Civil War's) expensive lesson will be measurably lost if it fails to impress upon us the fact that we have a distinctive American policy to work out – one sufficiently free from the traditions of Europe, to be suited to our peculiar situation and the genius of our enterprising countrymen."

This calls to mind the words of Thomas Jefferson on copying British banking policies, namely:

"...It will bring nothing to our country but wars, debts, and dilapidation. This has been the course of England ...And in copying her we do not seem to consider that like premises induce like consequences."

Those back of the Demonetizing Bill knew they could not have it discussed in open so they used diplomacy, stealth and chicanery to accomplish what would have been impossible by fair and honest means. Senator Sherman in the Senate and Congressman Hooper in the House introduced the legislation with straight faces and asked that it be passed promptly because of its interest to the Government. They intimated that it only affected the manner in which silver would be monetized, saying the Bill proposed to have silver coined in a government mint only.

From “The Truth About England and the New Europe,” by T. W. Hughes, it is learned that the Bankers of England held nearly a billion dollars in American Government bonds which had been issued by Lincoln to finance the Civil War (1860-1865). After this war, while commerce and industry were still disorganized, these bonds had fallen below par (perhaps were driven below par) and when they had struck bottom, they were bought up by English bankers and for a reason that will now appear.

On the face of these bonds were found the words “*Redeemable in Lawful Money of the United States.*” When these bonds were issued, they were redeemable in silver, but after 1872 the bonds had to be redeemed in gold because English bankers sent Ernest Seyd to bribe Congress to demonetize silver after which their American bonds had to be redeemed in gold, or “lawful money.”

There were two reasons for this conspiracy: First, gold was more easily controllable than silver which was produced in many countries the world over. Second, they knew that the demonetization of silver would make money scarce with the result of a terrible panic and depression, which would depreciate the value of everything we had, our corporate stocks and bonds, and our real capital goods. So they planned that when the effect of the panic had reached bottom, they would return to America and buy her best stocks and bonds in Banks, Railroads and Industry — *and for a small part of their value.*

Again the international bankers’ conspiracy worked out exactly as planned: Silver was demonetized, and the resulting Panic did depress stocks and bonds to half their former value. The English came back to America to buy Banks, Railroads and industries at their own price and buy them with the profits they had made on our government bonds that had to be redeemed in gold. Similar piracies by International Banking, continued to grow until 1917, when the *Pied Piper of London* came back again and lured us into his den for another terrible skinning by enticing us into his first World War.

When members of Congress got around to reading the Bill they were shocked to learn that they had been parties to the “Crime of 1873” and within three years the full import of the Bill was recognized as a camouflage for the demonetization of silver but was characteristically presented as the exact opposite — “*to make the silver dollar more beautiful, so it can float all over the world*” (Sherman). The bankers who had decreased the per capita money

supply of the nation from \$50.46 to \$14.60 could now collapse it still further (it fell to \$6.67) and thus exercise still greater control of America's money system.

In a sworn affidavit this same Ernest Seyd told James A. Miller:

"I went to America in the winter of 1873 authorized to secure, if I could, the passage of a Bill demonetizing silver as it was to the interest of those I represented – the Governors of the Bank of England—to have it done.

I took with me 100,000 pounds sterling (\$500,000) with the instructions that if that was not sufficient to accomplish the object, to draw another 100,000 pounds or as much more as was necessary. . . . I saw the Committee of the House and Senate and paid the money and staid in America until I knew the measure was safe.... Your people will not now comprehend the far-reaching extent of that measure, but they will in after years."

Mr. Hooper, who piloted the Bill through the house, said:

"I heard Hon. Gilbert DeLemartyr say that Judge Kelly told him that he saw the original bill for the demonetization of silver, and it was in Ernest Seyd's own handwriting."

President Grant, who signed the bill, stated:

"I did not know that the Act of 1873 demonetized silver. I was deceived in the matter."

Senator Voorhees in 1878 said:

"Never since the foundation of the government has a law of such vital and tremendous import, or indeed of any importance at all, crawled into our statute books so furtively or noiselessly as this. Its enactment there was so completely unknown to the people, and indeed to four-fifths of Congress itself, as the presence of a burglar in a house at midnight to its sleeping inmates."

Representative Holman said in the House, July, 1876:

"I have before me the record of the proceedings of the House on the passage of that measure, a record which no man can read without being convinced that the measure and the method of its passage through this House was a colossal swindle."

Americans were proud of their silver dollar. It was "good hard American money"; their favorite coin. The sneak thieves knew this and dared not to whisper their intended abduc-

tion of their most cherished currency and the curtailment of their dearest rights. The voters and taxpayers had no knowledge of or voice in this curtailment. Theirs was but to meet these obligations, and suffer the loss and fearful consequences of this treasonable act. An English financial agent was sent to make laws for the American people.

England had failed twice to subjugate America by bullets but her unscrupulous brigands accomplished by controlling the ballot with gold what the Empire could not do by bullets. England was the world's great creditor, holding bonds of all leading nations, and it was to her advantage (or rather to those who controlled her—the banks) to force payment in the dearest metal in the world. She already owned and controlled India which produced cotton and wheat—America's two great exports so that the demonetization of silver in America would act as a double leverage over her productions, especially since silver money was used exclusively in India. William J. Bryan in his speech "Bimetallism" exposed the fact that the prices of wheat and cotton are largely controlled in Liverpool, and that, when the price of silver goes down, our prices fall while the rupee (India) price remains the same.

Mr. Carlisle, in the House of Representatives in 1878 wisely and exactly prophesied:

"I know that the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever become so. Mankind will be fortunate, indeed, if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce and industry. According to my view of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age.

The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilence and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half of the metallic money in the world. With an ample currency, an industrious and frugal people will speedily rebuild their works of internal improvement and repair losses of property; but no amount of industry or economy on the part of the people can create money. When the Government creates it or authorizes it the citizen may acquire it, but he can do nothing more."

Language can never tell, nor figures approximate, the harm and misery brought upon this country by the entrenched powers of international finance. Bankruptcies and financial losses, suicides and increases of crime and immorality, starvation and widespread diseases, deprivations of educations and careers to many worthy youths, are but generalizations to the pangs of heartbreaks that brought immeasurable sufferings to untold multitudes of innocent victims that these fiendish brigands might wallow in ever-increasing power and luxuries.

Mankind might prayerfully hope that the record of atrocities against this nation and the world would stop here. But these vampires still find blood to suck from crushed and staggering peoples.

Chapter V

Next Act, Same Plot, Same Characters

"When through a process of law the common people have lost their homes, they will be more tractable and more easily governed by the strong arm of the law, applied by the central power of wealth, under the control of leading financiers. People without homes will not quarrel with their leaders. This is well known among our principal men now engaged in forming an IMPERIALISM OF CAPITAL TO GOVERN THE WORLD. Thus by discreet action we can secure for ourselves what has been generally planned and successfully accomplished."

That was part of a leaflet called the "Bankers' Manifest" printed for private circulation among leading bankers only. It appeared in 1934. Passing over some interesting monetary history, the next great step after the demonetization of silver was the so-called Federal Reserve Act of 1913, which brought to a reality this "imperialism of Capital to govern the world" now taking shape in the UN, Bretton Woods and the World Bank. To show this, the author takes in successive chapters the Federal Reserve Act, which completed American subjugation, the take-over in other parts of the world, especially Germany and Russia, the people responsible for World War I, those who caused World War II, and the culmination of the "imperialism of capital to govern the world" in the results of the late conflict.

The philosophy of the Federal Reserve Act was nothing new although it would be expected that the advancements of modern commerce and science would be based on a financial policy that would keep pace with it. Instead ... the scheming plots of 17th century money changers which long ago proved inadequate, antiquated, crooked, sinister and downright vicious, are still the norms on which the modern world is vainly striving to function for the peace and welfare of its peoples. The Federal Reserve Act looks as if it might have been written some 140 years ago by a notorious European gambler, John Law, who won the patronage of the Duke of Orleans, regent of France, and established a bank which became a royal bank although privately operated.

Law issued vast quantities of credit and immediately looked for a rich plum in America, annexing the Mississippi company with exclusive rights to Louisiana trade for twenty-five years. Two hundred thousand shares were issued, in payment of which he accepted notes of government indebtedness. Finally it became the government bank and, with Law as director, took over the national mint. When inflation brought ruin he blamed the results on enmity and panic. He had tapped the great sea of "credit," then little known or used in France, but which had been worked and wrecked twice by the Bank of England during the previous twenty years. For some reason little has been published of this incident during

the past few decades. The international bankers probably fear the public will see it as a prototype of their own recent cycles.

The basis of his money system is revealed in Law's own words:

"Any goods that have the qualities necessary in money, may be made money equal to their value. Five ounces of gold is equal in value say to \$100 and may be made money to that value; an acre of land is equal to \$100 and may be made equal to that value, for it has all the qualities necessary in money."

This is what the Federal Reserve Act does, but the fallacies are evident. Land does not have the qualities of money. It cannot be handed about from pocket to pocket. It has no recognized fixed value established by government fiat; its ever changing value disqualifies it as a security for value. The same faults apply to other commodities, such as notes and bills of exchange, which Law and our own Federal Reserve system used as a basis for issuing bank notes.

For its greatest success, Law contended that the bank should be the State. It would collect all revenues; attract all private deposits; issue money on the strength of public property; own property in its own name; loan to industry and commerce.

The Famous Aldrich Plan, the immediate basis for our Federal Reserve System, is very similar. The only difference is one which favors the bankers, for the Federal Reserve System not only takes the same pattern but also takes all the profits instead of turning them over to the State.

Reduced to one word the Federal Reserve Bank, like the Banks of England and France before it, is "DEBT." It started on a debt, its work is trading in debts, and it has always existed on debts. As in the case of the other banks, its life depends upon its ability to collect the debts that are owed to it faster than it has to pay the debts that it owes to others. This is what is called trading in credits or banker acceptances.

There is no security for any of the obligations in which it trades other than the speculative ability of the people to produce fast enough to keep ahead of the collection of taxes by the government and the collection of interest by the bank.

Every time money is used it is employed in payment of a debt. It is the acme of absurdity, therefore, that money should itself come into existence as a debt. It has been shown that credit is clearly a debt.

While on the subject of banks and debts, it is evident considering their nature that the banks are more powerful than the Government of the United States, for if they were not, there would be no such thing as a National Debt. National debts are unnecessary in a country with the real and potential wealth and resources as the United States; they are the greatest of national burdens and the evils the Government would be foremost in avoiding. But on the other hand they are the biggest source of riches and control in the hands of the

American financial system. That we have a National Debt is not only evidence of the real rulers of the nation, but the extent of the debt is a true indication of the extent of this rule.

It is absurd that the Government should be forced to borrow that which it has, under the Constitution, the power to create!

Ever since the banks were given the right to issue money, panics, financial depressions, famines, and the inevitable increase of crime have been periodic occurrences. In America the average is about every twelve years. They shall continue until the government assumes its natural prerogative of issuing money, and confining the work of bankers to banking.

The panic of 1907 which broke like a clap of thunder and lingered like a dying tree is the setting in which the impetus of the Federal Reserve System had its beginning. Even the bankers of the nation, except for a few of the international ilk, had no hint of the coming calamity. The few who created the money scarcity deliberately intended to "clean up," little banks and all, and force their system upon an impoverished, innocent nation. These people have persistently worked for the control of all banks so that it is virtually impossible for one to remain outside the Federal Reserve System.

J. Pierpont Morgan, Sr., who began his career profiting from the slaughter of the Civil War with fraudulent army and navy supplies, was in continual proven fraudulent scandals, a ruthless wrecker of opposition, magnate of coal and railroads, a continual milker of government, plotter of panics, extender of corruption, looter of steel and insurance trusts, evader of justice and laws, a power over propaganda sources which later caused him to be known by such titles as "savior of the nation," "grand old man of Wall Street," etc., made billions in profits. The international bankers highly approved of his conduct. Lord Avebury, Chairman of the London Bankers acclaimed Morgan as "*a genius, and we bankers are proud of him.*" Alfred De Rothschild of Paris, said:

"It is impossible in a few words to do justice to this giant in finance, a man equally great in everything connected with science and art."

A Committee of Banking and Currency authorized by the House of Representatives in 1912, after a thorough examination, reported that the increased concentration of control of money and credit had been effected, and in a number of ways. One of these was by means of consolidations of competitive or potentially competitive banks and trust companies. The same powerful interests became large stockholders in these. Another way was by the system of interlocking directorates. A third way was the control over management secured by big banking houses, banks and trust companies in insurance companies, railroads and public utility and other corporations. This control was obtained by means of stockholdings, voting trusts, or by supplying money requirements enabling the bankers to participate in determining the business and financial policies of a multitude of corporations. Still

other ways of fortifying this control were set forth and the report dealt almost exclusively with J. P. Morgan and Company.

Nothing was left undone to tie up the medium of exchange. Money was as high as 50% on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange. New York banks even refused to honor drafts of interior banks on their own deposits in those Big City banks.

This was the setting in which Senator Nelson W. Aldrich was sponsoring what later became the Federal Reserve Bank Law. Although rarely taking part in debate on the floor of the Senate, he was powerful in committee legislative work and conducted a limited tour of the nation in support of a plan intended to increase the effectiveness of resources through their control by reserve associations. The general public was suspicious of the scheme but the big bankers, whose interests always opposed those of the general public, saw possibilities in it. Accordingly, the National Bankers' Association adopted the plan, rewrote it and made a few additions.

Of the Aldrich Banking and Currency Plan, Charles Lindbergh, Sr., said to be the only man in the House who read the entire twenty volumes of the Aldrich Monetary Commission, said:

"The Aldrich Banking and Currency Plan is a monstrous scheme to place under one control all the finances of the country, public and private. It would create one great central association with fifteen branches to encompass all the states.... It would admit of no membership except banks and trust companies, and exclude the smaller ones of these. The rest of the world would not only be excluded from holding stock, but by the nature of the association, powers and relations of finances to commerce, it would dictate the terms on which business should be done. With that power centered in the great city banks and these banes controlled by the trusts and money powers, the politics as well as the business of the country would be under its dictation.

The government prosecuted other trusts, but supports the money trust.... I have been waiting patiently for several years for an opportunity to expose the false money standard, and to show that the greatest of all favoritism is that extended by the government to the money trust."

A new Bill was written and informally called the Owen-Glass Bill because piloted in the Senate by Robert Owen and in the House by Carter Glass. Legally it was the Federal Reserve Bill which, as it first passed the Senate, contained the all important mandatory provisions requiring the Reserve Board to maintain stable price levels, a provision which was stricken out under Glass in the House, thereby changing the entire nature and intention of the Act.

The venerable Robert Owen wrote some interesting information on this particular event in a foreword to "Money Creators" by Gertrude Coogan. After outstanding academ-

ic achievements, Owen established the first national bank chartered in Oklahoma, was its president for ten years and a director for forty-five years. He supported William J. Bryan in his strenuous presidential campaign for remonetization of silver and a ratio of 16 to 1. Bryan fought for an honest monetary system to protect the United States against panics and depressions but *“was defeated solely by a studied and expressive campaign of deception and ridicule, the threat of panic and the use of money.”*

In 1898 Owen went to Europe and studied at first hand the Bank of England through its Governors, the Bank of France through its Directors. Two years later he devised a plan for the issuance of United States legal tender when national production necessitated an increase in money supply. In the Senate he wrote the first Federal Reserve Bill presented but it was expanded and contained provisions he did not favor; so he got the Senate to strike out this Bill and pass the original Owen draft. The purpose of the Bill was to establish and maintain the stable value of money under mandate; but this mandatory provision was struck out by the House. Says Owen:

“I was unable to keep this mandatory provision in the Bill because of the secret hostilities developed against it, the origin of which at that time I did not fully understand.”

He would have understood had he known the man behind this opposition to anything beneficial to the American economy and for everything aiding the international bankers. This man was Paul M. Warburg, who was born in Germany, brought up in the banking business in Hamburg where he became part of the Reichsbank system. In 1902, while still in Germany, he became a member of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, which is next in importance to the Morgan branch and which has headquarters in New York City. With this company he served as a director of various banks, trust companies, railroads and other organizations. He came to America in 1906, became a citizen of this nation in 1911, was decorated by the Kaiser in 1912, helped a Republican Senator write and pass the Federal Reserve Bank Act which became law in 1913, and was appointed by a Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, Vice-Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in 1914.

The Warburg story indicates five things:

1. The International bankers plot to bring the Reichsbank into the full fraternalship with the Banks of England, France and America in the ensuing war.
2. It is no crime to collaborate with the enemy when it is done by big bankers. (War was more near than was the late war when we called Germany “the enemy.” They knew it was coming and hastening the enactment of the Federal Reserve system was in preparation for it. The war was all over except for the shooting, bleeding and paying—from all of which these princes of privilege were majestically immune.)

3. There is no consideration of the welfare of nationals when the profits of a few international bankers are at stake.

4. Nationalities, forms of government, political theories all mean nothing when the welfare of this class is concerned.

5. The continued complete domination of American financial policies by a foreign group of international hypocrites.

Accepting these as facts we need not be amazed that such a recent arrival from a foreign country be given one of the most important positions in our nation, a position in which he was largely responsible for the organization of our banking system; nor need we be astonished that such a recently naturalized citizen should be given such preference over thousands of capable life-long American citizens. We do not wonder that the institution he was so instrumental in establishing should be operated rather in the interests of internationalism and foreign nations than in the interest of the United States; nor that it has shown more interest in stabilizing the franc and the pound sterling than the dollar. We know that the economic and political supremacy of international financiers depends upon maintaining a universal monetary stringency in order that there shall be a perpetual world-wide demand for their credit, the interest on which is their greatest treasure.

Paul M. Warburg claims a share in formulating the Federal Reserve System. Writing in "The Federal Reserve System, Its Origin and Growth," he says:

"I do not claim to have originated any new banking principle; but from my arrival in America I have been impelled to urge the adoption of the fundamental principles upon which, under varying forms, were based the practices of every industrially advanced country except the United States. It was owing to the interest I had shown in banking reform that, when the Aldrich Banking and Currency Committee was appointed, I was invited to assist in formulating a plan providing for the creation of a Central Reserve Association with regional branches."

The Currency Committee of the Merchants of New York recognized the proposed United States Reserve Bank as Paul M. Warburg's plan "to end all currency famines and money panics, and relieve the national treasury of all responsibility for the money market, international exchanges and movements of gold."

In his introduction to a series of essays by Paul Warburg, Mr. Edwin R. A. Seligman writes:

"It may be stated without fear of contradiction that in its fundamental features the Federal Reserve Act is the work of Mr. Warburg more than of any other man in the country."

Warburg and his fellow conspirators drafted the Federal Reserve Act at a secret meeting of a group of American (sic) bankers who, of course, wanted our financial system to be an imitation of England's with no consideration of the vast differences in their respective economics. The bankers told the people that they had at last perfected the last word in the nature of financial legislation for positive Federal security of our national monetary system. The fact is the written Act is a masterpiece of duplicity and subjugation.

A few secrets on the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act were made known by Frank A. Vanderlip in an article in the Saturday Evening Post in 1935. He writes:

"Despite my views about the value to society of greater publicity for the affairs of corporations, there was an occasion, near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive, indeed, as furtive, as any conspirator.

... Stillman (international agent in France) also reported to me that in his talk with Senator Aldrich he himself had not expressed any views, except as he had impressed on the Senator his belief in the necessity of not being too much influenced by our Wall Street point of view.

Since it would be fatal to Senator Aldrich's plan to have it known that he was calling on anybody from Wall Street to help him in preparing his report and Bill, precautions were taken that would have delighted the heart of James Stillman. Those who had been asked to go (to a secret draft session) were Henry Davison, Paul Warburg, Ben Strong, and myself. From Washington came A. Piatt Andrew, Jr., who was then an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and who now is a Member of Congress from Massachusetts. We were told to leave our last names behind us. We were told, further, that we should avoid dining together on the night of our departure. We were instructed to come one at a time and as unobtrusively as possible to the railroad terminal on the New Jersey littoral of the Hudson, where Senator Aldrich's private car would be in readiness, attached to the rear end of a train for the South.

When I came to that car, the blinds were down and only slender threads of amber light showed the shape of the windows. Once aboard the private car we began to observe the taboo that had been fixed on last names. We addressed one another as "Ben," "Paul," "Nelson," "Abe"—it is Abraham Piatt Andrew. Davison and I adopted even deeper disguises, abandoning our own first names. On the theory that we were always right, he became Wilbur and I become Orville, after those two aviation experts, the Wright brothers.

...Warburg, the best-equipped man there in an academic sense, was so intense and apparently felt a little antagonism toward Aldrich ...Aldrich never was a man to be a mere servant of the money interests."

Present at this secret conference were: Senator Nelson A. Aldrich, Chairman Finance Committee of the United States Senate; Paul M. Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., later made Vice-Governor of Federal Reserve Board; A Piatt Andrews, Assistant Secretary of the United States Treasury; Henry P. Davidson, of J. P. Morgan & Co.; Frank A. Vanderlip, President of National City Bank of New York. Is it any wonder the banking act they devised served private financial interests at the expense of any national considerations such as the common good of all!

Woodrow Wilson was elected on a Democratic platform which expressed opposition to the Aldrich plan, so the moneyed interests changed the name and passed a bill containing all the essential points of the so-called Aldrich plan for a central bank. The same Woodrow Wilson signed it.

The American Federal Reserve Bank is not American, it is not Federal, it is not a reserve bank. It is not American because it is English in origin and principle; it is not Federal because it is owned by private men for private profit—like a neighborhood grocery store. It is not a reserve bank; its deposits do not have a reasonable proportion of reserves behind them. The suggested legislation requiring 100% reserves for deposits would at least part way make the bank live up to its name.

The word "Federal" was purposely deceiving. Until Father Coughlin took the air in 1934 practically everyone believed the Federal Reserve Banks were federal. Yet here are the facts:

1. Private bankers own all the stock and take all the profits.
2. The government does not pay members of the Reserve Board salaries as she would if they were working for her.
3. The federal government does not even give the Federal Reserve System a list of duties.

Another bit of duplicity not only fooled the public, but Congress as well. When the original Act was passed Congress was led to believe that the Federal Reserve Agent and the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board were two separate and distinct offices held by men with different interests at heart. The Reserve Agent was to look after the interests of the people and act as a beneficial check upon the Governor with banking interests at heart. The fact is, both offices are held by the same man, the Governor of the Reserve Board (in case you didn't guess) who has only the interests of the banks at heart. He has two offices for the two duties, one across the hall from the other in the Central Reserve Bank in New York City. It is tragically typical of the consideration the interests of the people have in our nation's financial system.

Perhaps the most common form of hypocrisy exists in the tricky bank statements these patriarchs of plunder are obliged to issue periodically. The Chase National Bank, J. P. Morgan and Co. of New York, the Bankers Trust Company, the National City Bank of New York, to mention only a few, mostly Morgan controlled, begin their statements, "Cash and Due from Banks," "Cash on Hand and on Deposit in Banks," "Cash, Due from Banks and Bankers," as their principle source of assets. This first item means the small amount of actual currency on hand in the banks is insignificant with the much larger amount of bookkeeping money or credit money (debts) which is owed to these banks either by the Federal Reserve Bank or by other banks. The item "Cash" and "Due from Banks" are therefore united because if the public realized how little real cash all the banks have in relation to what they pretend to have (deposits), the basic crookedness of the monetary system would be apparent. This dual item is placed first not only because it is the greatest source of assets, but also to falsely bolster public confidence in the "soundness" of their companies.

Their boast of "Federal security" was more deception. Just recall how much Security it established. Did it make money panics impossible? Did it make money and credit available at all times for the use of agriculture and industry? If they wanted national security they would have provided for the giving of money to the banks through the banks. How much security was there in 1929 when almost overnight the \$62 billion of bond and credit money shrank to forty-two billion? The workers of the nation did not become lazy overnight, nor did the fields of the country suddenly dry up, nor did the factories of America collapse all at once; the fault is with their "last word in the nature of financial legislation." There never can be any real security in the nation as long as debts are used as bank and credit money. The Federal Reserve System never has been and never will be anything but a farcical disaster, the inevitable cause of panics and depressions. It is the one cause of our economic slavery. Because the system is a proven failure it cannot even be called an experiment.

The following is a notice posted on the bulletin board of a Federal Reserve Bank in Chicago for the attention of its employees:

"In view of the ultra-confidential character of the work of the Federal Reserve Banks, and because undue importance may be attached to even informal or personal comments, officers and employees of this institution are requested not to disclose to anyone other than an employee or officer of the bank entitles thereto any information obtained in the course of his or her work. They are particularly cautioned against discussing with outsiders any matters relating to the present or future policy of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Reserve Banks, or any member bank."

The effects of Federal Reserve policies are public and the public should therefore have access to a knowledge of those policies. If, in a free America, the most important function

of a nation's operation, the monetary system, must be kept secret the reason is that it needs secrecy to escape detection.

Of the Federal Reserve propaganda books and leaflets that have come to the author's attention one of the most clever and typical is a question and answer booklet. The following sample is found:

"Does the Federal Reserve Bank Coin Money or Regulate its Value?

No. Metallic money is coined in the minds of the United States Government, and paper currency, including the Federal Reserve notes of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, is prepared by the United State Bureau of Engraving and Printing, both under the direction of the United States Treasury. The power to regulate the value of money rests in Congress, but Congress has authorized the President to fix, within certain limits, the amount of gold constituting the dollar."

The charge that they do coin money and regulate its value has been made so often they had to answer it. And the answer had to be "No"; otherwise they would convict their system of unconstitutionality. With that much assured they had to resort to trickery for the reason for their answer. Notice in the first part of the first sentence that they use the term "metallic money" in connection with the verb "to coin." Metallic money constitutes a negligible portion of our money; coins and currency (billfold money) combined constitute about five percent. Ninety-five percent of the nation's business is conducted by banker-manufactured debt credit money; this is the real national currency and is made by the bankers themselves with the use of their fountain pens.

The second part of the first sentence states *"paper currency is prepared by the United States Bureau of Engraving and Printing."* Even if entirely true, which it is not, the amount of money affected (we saw that paper currency and coins combined constitute about 5 %) would be infinitesimal. The whole truth is that member banks of the Federal Reserve System obtain Federal Reserve notes from the United States by sending to the United States Treasury government bonds to the face value of the number of \$5, \$10, etc., bills desired. The Treasury places the government bonds in sealed containers on which is labeled the name of the bank. The bank receives from the Bureau of Engraving Federal Reserve Notes to the full value of the bonds sent to the Treasury, at a cost of 30 cents per thousand bills—the cost of printing. The Treasury of the U. S., a world-renowned institution looked upon as an emblem of power and respect, is but a mere group of job printers for a few private bankers.

Concerning the regulation of value, their answer again concerns an insignificant portion. Since their bookkeeping credit entries constitute practically all our money, is the only

worthwhile source of value regulation. Their entire “answer” reminds one of an observation by Stephen Leacock that half truths, like half bricks, travel farther.

In “The Hidden Power of Money,” Fred H. Kiser has this to say about the Federal Reserve Act:

“Its main object was to force Domestic Purchasing Power to the lowest possible level by calling in loans. It was an Act calculated to yield opportunities for greater manipulation of business cycles; establish smaller minimum reserves; promote circulation of more fictitious money (Bankers’ Credit); compel producers to accept export trade–foreign markets; force the standard of wages down; influence the International Banking System throughout the world to raise interest rates; allocate to the Government but a ‘slight’ share only, of the profits derived from the operation of the Exclusive Money Franchise; allow small local banks a 13% reserve against demand deposits, and 3% against time deposits, thereby establishing a system whereby each ‘dollar’ deposited as a Demand Deposit could be expanded seven times, and for each dollar deposited as a Time Deposit thirty-three times; required reserves of small banks to be kept in the district’s Federal Reserve Bank against which they said Federal Reserve Bank would keep a 35 % Gold Reserve...

As proof that I am presenting a correct analysis of the original draft of the Federal Reserve Act which embodied in its Financial Authors’ intentions, I shall leave the subject for you to ponder over by emphasizing this fact–since 1920, our assets have been reduced over 200-Billion Dollars through and by the Money Managers and their unconstitutional manipulation of the money in circulation. This should explain to everyone why the Federal Reserve Act was passed, and also why it must be repealed.”

When asked why the Secretary of the Treasury was no longer on the Federal Reserve Board, a big banker said:

“Because we kicked him off the Board.”

When asked why the President of the United States was no longer on the Federal Reserve Board, the big banker said:

“Because we kicked him off the Board.”

They have been kicking Presidents around ever since. In fact, if the bankers were not more powerful than the Presidents there would be no national debt at all.

Impossible as it might seem, the financial plank of the Democratic Party in 1916 is an abundant source of laughs. It reads:

"Our archaic banking and currency system, prolific of panic and disaster under Republican administrations – long the refuge of the Money Trust–has been supplanted by the Federal Reserve Act, a true democracy of credit under Government control, already proved a financial bulwark in a world crisis mobilizing our resources, placing abundant credit at the disposal of legitimate industry, and making a currency panic impossible."

Can anyone say with a straight face the Federal Reserve System is a true democracy of credit, is under Government control, places abundant credit at the disposal of industry, or makes currency panics impossible?

Prosperity is a tragedy under the Federal Reserve System because it necessarily brings depression. Why? Because in prosperity people pay off their debts and thereby cancel this credit money (debt) out of existence. The consequent scarcity of money is a contribution towards depression.

The calling in of loans contributes to a liquidation in the business cycle while an expansion of credit tends toward recovery. Economists tell us business runs in cycles of prosperity, liquidation, depression and recovery, which, they tell us, is the natural course business automatically takes; the hint of mystery and confession of ignorance in this theory fools nobody who knows even the simplest basic rules of our monetary system. Although it is known that professors often make poor students, one hesitates to say economists are unaware of these rules, but, if they are aware of them, the other alternative is to accuse them of deception. If they do not know the functions of money they are too little informed to properly teach economics; if they do know the functions of money and still maintain the theory of the business cycle, they are too dishonest to teach anything.

This Debacle of Debt, the Federal Reserve Banking System, is a system of debt, by debt and for debt. The bigger the debt the more profitable this un-American, anti-American racket becomes. The extremity of its perversion is seen in the fact that for it war is a blessing, and indeed the greatest of all blessings because it brings the greatest of all national debts; interest on these debts is its principal source of income.

"We need have no fear of the national debt because we owe it to ourselves," was a popular bit of New Deal philosophy (what abuse that word philosophy takes these days). In the first place we don't owe it to ourselves; we owe it to those few, some of them foreigners, who hold the securities. The debt is represented by government securities. The securities are held by a special group of American and foreign owners, some individual, some institutional. In the hands of these securities holders the debt is a continuing claim on the flow of goods and services produced by the rest of us. By the rest of us – that's the key phrase. For while the claim on goods and services represented by the debt is held by a special group of

the people, it is all the rest of us who must meet that claim. And it is to be feared because of the lengths we shall have to plunge in order to meet it.

From another source the author once answered this argument as follows: That we owe the national debt to ourselves is one of the craftiest bits of financial propaganda the sycophants of the Money Monopoly ever handed a gullible public. The argument in support of this theory is that the burden of interest which pays the national debt is not of itself a burden because the interest goes back to the economy, increases income, and thereby increases our ability to pay taxes. The individual taxpayer finds little comfort in the act that in the national accounting the taxes he pays are balanced by the interest that the bankers receive.

Carry this theory to its logical conclusion and see what would happen. Since the people owe the debt and interest to themselves, and since it will cost them less if they stop the interest (because they hire high-salaried tax collectors to take their money from them and also hire expensive bureaucrats to pay it back to them) the people should stop paying interest. If the majority of the taxpayers once came to this conclusion, the big bankers would soon be yelling that financial disaster is upon the country, that the nation is bankrupt, that all investments and securities are worthless. Their own theory would prove very unpopular when the people, having borrowed themselves into a big debt decided they could cancel the debt without harm, since they would, according to the logic of the theory, be cancelling it to themselves.

It is because all money is debt money that America as the richest nation in the world is also the farthest in debt.

It is evident that this debt system of national banking is essential to the monopoly of power upon which the great banks depend in order to control the movements of nations, governments and of every inconspicuous individual that makes up nations. It is equally clear that in order to subvert the common sense of the average man they must inveigle him into their money-lending rackets, in spite of the bloody booby traps they set for him.

Upon their lunatic proposition rests the future peace and prosperity of the entire world. The asinine delusion that a grand new world can emerge from expanding industry by mere spending and investment at interest plays directly into the hands of the central banks' already overwhelming power. Since they control the "money" expanded it is they who will control the industries which shall be expanded.

Professor Frederick J. Soddy, famous scientist, Nobel prize winner, and originator of the virtual wealth theory of economics, is now quoted at length because his words seem to be an irrefutable summation of what the author has been saying about the Federal Reserve System.

"The most sinister and anti-social feature about bank-deposit money is that it has no existence. The banks owe the public for a total amount of money which does not exist. In buying and selling, implemented by check transac-

tions, there is a mere change in the party to whom the money is owed by the banks. As the one depositor's account is debited, the other is credited and the banks can go on owing for it all the time.

The whole profit of the issuance of money has provided the capital of the great banking business as it exists today. Starting with nothing whatever of their own, they have got the whole world into their debt irredeemably, by a trick.

This money comes into existence every time the banks 'lend' and disappears again every time the debt is repaid them. So that if industry tries to repay, the money of the nation disappears. This is what makes prosperity so 'dangerous' as it destroys money just when it is most needed and precipitates a slump!

There is nothing left now for us but to get ever deeper and deeper into debt to the banking system in order to provide the increasing amounts of money the nation requires for its expansion and growth. An honest money system is the only alternative."

There is much more that could be said about this American branch of the International Banking fraternity. But in a work of analyzing and synthesizing such as this, a writer cannot succumb to the temptation of laying unproportionate stress upon one phase of a broad subject replete with important divisions. Some of the other arguments can be found in the twenty-seven indictments against the Federal Reserve Banks drawn up by an outstanding American monetary authority in deadly parallel with the twenty-seven indictments against the British crown in the Declaration of Independence.... His charges constitute a declaration of independence against the rulers of the British crown today, and are as follows:

They have refused to permit Congress to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

They have kept banking in private hands, allotting both money and credit at will to their friends.

They have promoted the growth of giant corporations to the extent that money and power are concentrated into the hands of a few.

They have loaned abroad in private loans our people's money, leaving worthless securities in lieu thereof.

They drove America into the World Wars to secure the credit of the British Empire, at the consequent cost of thousands of lives and billions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States.

They have secured the loans of over billions of public monies to foreign nations, now wholly in default.

They have so promoted foreign trade by inducing the sale of American goods abroad in exchange for foreign goods, that we have imported at an estimated loss of many billions, since the beginning of this century

They have prompted, as far back as the Civil War; the system of National Banks which permitted the banker to obtain interest on his investments as well as paper currency for his capital. They have floated foreign and worthless issues of German bonds and South American bonds in this nation, robbing the people of our surplus, to meet their inordinate demands for interest and commission.

They have promoted wildcat issues of stocks and bonds of domestic corporations.

They have dominated the Treasury of the United States and dictated its policies.

They have placed their representatives before the people for selection in the highest places of preferment.

They have covered the country with false and lying propaganda, prostituted the press and invaded the schools, with their campaign for so-called sound money.

They have sent their lobbyists to Washington, against the interests of the people and for the protection of their selfish interest.

They have induced the government of the United States to refuse to issue adequate currency, but rather to issue interest bearing bonds, in exchange for book credits issued by the banks, over-subscribing each issue till now the national debt has reached an all-time high financed largely by banks which never had a full billion of actual currency in their vaults.

They have accepted as deposits the savings of the people and issued in credit ten times the amount of currency in the counterfeit, fiction money of credit.

They have sent their salesmen into municipalities and all forms of local governments with the offer of loans for public works in order to secure a supply of tax-exempt securities for their wealthier customers.

They have opposed every effort to reform taxation and placed the burden on all classes of people and on all forms of wealth.

They have financed rebellions in friendly nations in order to take over the very governments themselves.

They have financed wars for the profit on war and induced armament races for the profits on armaments and munitions.

They have expanded credit periodically and taken the profit on rising markets only to sell securities before a preordained period of deflation. They have called loans, caused a wide contraction of credit, destroyed values and purchased or confiscated property at bankrupt prices.

They have destroyed the opportunity of America becoming the financial and foreign exchange market of the world and have induced even the Treasury of the United States to buy and sell in London.

They have filled the vaults of little banks with worthless securities and caused endless bank failures in the nation.

They have opposed the economic welfare of the farmer, played the game of the city against the rural community, the manufacturer against the industrial laborer, and the foreigner against the American citizen.

They have pitted large industry against small industry, denying credit to the 97 percent of our manufacturers who employ less than 250 men each and concert bating credit with large industry, thus adversely affecting many wage earners of the nation.

They have, through their political manipulator, Baruch, induced this government to establish such devices as the NRA for letting industries write their own codes, which means that the power and resources of big industry have dominated the codes.

In the Executive Department of our present administration, they have seated their representatives of their largest corporations in America, for the purpose of actually framing the laws through the Department of Commerce; and in the Legislative Department they have appeared in the guise of associations—the American Bankers, the Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association—opposing every salutary law contemplated for the public economic welfare.

John Elsom, writing in “Lightning Over the Treasury Building,” lists fifteen grievances against the violation of Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the Constitution (“Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof”) as practiced by the Federal Reserve Banking System. They are as follows:

It has allowed the usurpation by the Banking System of the power reposed in Congress to issue and regulate the value of money.

It has given us a system of legalized banditry unparalleled in the history of nations.

It has given us a Government—not of the people—but by a small group of Internationalists who dominate our Legislative Bodies.

It has made of every citizen a bondsman (slave) of the Money-Creating, Bond-Holding Bankers.

It has caused to be created a National debt of mounting billions—all of which should have been issued by Congress, instead of borrowed.

It has allowed Banks to obtain money from the U. S. Treasury for the cost of printing (27 cents per thousand dollars); to create money with a fountain pen by falsely entering a Bank Loan as a Bank Deposit.

It has made it possible for the Banks to loan at interest from 20 to 30 times the amount they have in cash. There is less than One Billion Dollars of currency in all Banks, while there are 70 Billion Dollars of Bank Deposits, so-called. 97 % of Bank Deposits are Bank Loans—the borrowers supplying the credit. There is less than 1 3/4 cents in cash behind each dollar of bank deposits throughout the Nation.

It has made it possible for the Banks to expand and then contract credit—by which process they have obtained control of 87 % of our National wealth by owning outright through foreclosures, or holding mortgages on that percentage of assessed properties.

It has caused, apart from all other foreclosures, 600 families every day, for years, to be dispossessed. Every minute of every working hour a family is forced to vacate, to satisfy the demands of greed.

It has caused the domination of our School System by the money monopolists, in the matter of Economics, so that college graduates do not know that the Government does not issue our principal medium of exchange—that the Federal Reserve is Not a Government Bank—that the Government gave, without charge to the Federal Reserve Bank, 7/9 of the Nation's hoard of Gold—that our present economy is unconstitutional—or that wars are not fought for the preservation of Democracy, but rather for the preservation of the Money System, collection of European investments and to increase the National Debt.

It has established a monetary system by which every dollar must be borrowed into circulation and pay interest to the Shylock money-creating Bankers 27 cents of every earned dollar goes for interest charges.

It has resulted in the Federal Reserve System, a private banking institution, becoming the Fiscal Agent of our Government, in which capacity it absolutely controls the financial affairs of the Nation and all subdivisions thereof, as well as every person living therein.

It has produced a situation which has made seemingly necessary the planned destruction of, or curtailment of production, of consumable goods, while 69 million Americans are in dire need, many actually starving to death in the midst of abundance.

It has caused the prostitution of the Courts to the point that the poor man cannot obtain justice in civil actions where insurance companies, banks or their subservient stooges are involved.

It has caused foreign "isms" to make disastrous inroads upon America and Americanism, by causing discontent through granting unjust and unconstitutional special privilege to a chosen few

Conclusive and irrefutable arguments against the constitutionality of the Federal Reserve Act are found in the last pages of Chapter III, "Citadels of Chaos."

This recalls to mind an observation made by Justice of the Supreme Court, Louis D. Brandeis in his stimulating little book, "Other Peoples' Money," via:

"The goose that lays golden eggs has been considered a valuable possession. But even more profitable is the privilege of taking the golden eggs by somebody else's goose. The investment bankers now enjoy that privilege. If the bankers' power were commensurate only with their wealth they would have relatively little influence on American business. They control the people through the people's own money."

No better summary of the evils of the Federal Reserve System can be found than that contained in the Minority Report of the Federal Reserve Bill by Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., after its original hearing. He wrote as follows:

"It violates every principal of popular Democratic Representative Government and every declaration of the Democratic Party and platform pledges from Thomas Jefferson down to the beginning of this Congress.

It recognizes the superior sovereignty of the embodied institution of money over any power of government so that neither the government, in its sovereign capacity, nor the people or their representatives can initiate the placement of one dollar of monetary functionary into actual exchange among the people except through the agency of organized money loaners with purely selfish interests.

The Glass Bill positively abolishes the United States Treasury and the public money of the people and substitutes the so-called Federal Reserve Banks, which by the term of the Bill, are to be the exclusive stock of the bankers. It reduces the people's treasury Department and the Bureau of Printing and Engraving to the position of a job printing house for the private use of bankers."

The consequences of the Federal Reserve System have been mainly the existence of bigger and better panics and bigger and better wars. Following this crime of 1913 came the depression of 1923, the panic of 1929 and New Deal monetary enactments

The depression of 1923 was chartered at a secret bankers meeting May 19, 1920, in Washington, D. C. The big bankers of the Federal Reserve Board planned the depression with deliberate coolness and diabolical intent by breaking as many small independent banks not members of the Federal Reserve System as they could; Information of this par-

ticular episode is taken principally from the undenied material given on the floor of Congress by Finly H. Gray, courageous advocate for sound money.

For almost three years no one knew of this secret meeting; neither did anyone know who attended or the resolution passed. When the manipulation bankers and financiers became involved in a dispute over certain Liberty Loan bonds affected by their resolution, the truth leaked out in an account of the proceedings which appeared in the Manufacturers Record of Baltimore, Maryland, as a stroke of revenge or retaliation. Then one day under orders of the Federal Reserve Board, without warning, with the people and nonmember banks groping in darkness, the discount rate on bonds was raised and continued from two percent to as high as 85 percent in some farm banks. Reserve banks then began selling bonds and securities until 1 1/2 billion dollars in currency and 10 1/2 billion dollars in credit money was withdrawn from the money supply in eight months.

Under the law of money, the value of money and property of these manipulators doubled, and even tripled. On the other hand the law of money, through the contraction of money, forced farm values down, cut earnings in half, making interest, debts, taxes and mortgages twice as burdensome. The loss to farmers alone in this deliberate deflation was more than \$50 billion, or nearly double the cost of American participation in World War I.

Six thousand banks failed in three years (before the crash Chicago had 223 banks and after the crash had only 56), there were 16,500 commercial failures in 1923 which increased until the total reached 40,000 in 1932; the wheels of industry slackened and brought unemployment, the buying and consuming power of many millions was destroyed. The fatal circle of hard times, wants, suffering and distress in the midst of plenty and abundance was realized and complete.

The chairman of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Jesse H. Jones, admitted:

"In the beginning a few bankers were actually selfish enough to be willing to see their competitors fail, but when the fire began to spread, the biggest and strongest were appealing to the government that something be done to save the situation."

These big bankers knew the effects of their contraction of credit because W. P. G. Harding, chairman of the secret meeting said:

"We all know that if the bankers in any community large or small, were to clasp the screws on tight, they could bring disaster upon the community, which might spread to other communities."

When this group of bankers were told by John S. Williams, comptroller of the currency, of the distress that would befall the farmers, the big bankers said:

"They (the farmers) ought to be ruined; they are getting so prosperous they won't work!"

Anyone who has ever observed the daily routines of both bankers and farmers knows that farmers do more work before the bankers leave their beds than the bankers do all day—a day which the bankers conclude long before the farmers do their burdensome chores. But the important point is not in the falsity of the statement as much as it is in the assumption that the banker has a right to punish the farmer for not working if he doesn't want to. It is made all the more irksome because the farmer is the world's most important, fundamental and dependable producer, while the banker not only produces nothing but is the world's most gigantic parasite.

Some day the farmer will learn enough of such statements that the big banker will find himself doing a little honest labor, either on a securely enclosed, heavily guarded institutional rock pile, or at some respectable profession on the outside. After all, other counterfeiters and forgers are prosecuted, why not the private bankers who make money with a stroke of the pen and redeem it from other people's pockets.

Finly H. Gray rightly observed that:

"This depression is not a mystery; it is a conspiracy, a deep-laid criminal plot. No pirates boarded a merchant ship to scuttle and sink the vessel, no highway robbers ever rode masked, no banded burglars ever blew a safe with more deliberate criminal intent than the international financiers and banners who maneuvered from afar or pulled the manipulating wires from behind closed doors and closed curtains, directing their tools and puppets in the secret banker's meeting and on the Federal Reserve Board, fawning to do their will and bidding."

Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., stated the situation in a single sentence. Said he:

"Under the Federal Reserve Act, panics are scientifically created; the present (1920) is the first scientific one, worked out as we figure a mathematical problem."

From "The Hidden Power of Money," by Kiser, we read:

"By relating these incidents I think we can get a very clear picture of what actually happened at the Secret Bankers' Meeting on May 18, 1920, which was held primarily to appease the feelings of English money racketeers who were jealous of America's financial condition at that time. Certainly this single event, if no other of similar character had ever occurred, should enable

us to understand the destructive features of the Federal Reserve Act—to grasp the significance of the Hidden Power of Money.”

The panic of 1929 was planned as a “coup de grace” of the movement started in that secret meeting in 1920. The stock market indicates but does not cause business conditions. When the market crashed the panic had struck. On October 24, 1929, at 11:00 o’clock hundreds of thousands of shares in hundreds of issues were offered for sale “at the market.” It was no mere coincidence that everyone decided to sell at the same instant or that they all decided to sell at the market. International bankers who knew the day and the hour the collapse would come began to liquidate after the Hatry failure in London a month previously. European sellers of securities converted into cash and transferred their balances abroad.

From 1929 to 1932 money created for loan-making by the Federal Reserve Board shrank \$17.2 billions and 10,111 banks either failed or were taken over by other banks. Despite the relatively small number of Federal Reserve banks they “owned” most all the bank deposits in the country.

While our people suffered and the nation was almost ruined, three European nations benefited. While our government Liberty Bonds, bought “till it hurts” at 100 cents on a dollar, were sold at “bargain prices,” these dear allies of ours who since contemptuously repudiated their war debts to us, had representatives on our exchanges. The presence of these agents was euphemistically described as in harmony with our food administrator’s plan to “give cheap food to Europe.” After commodity prices catapulted downward they cashed in and with part of the profits they had cleverly stolen from the farmers, they bought 146 million bushels of our wheat, took the wheat and surplus profits back to Europe.

The United States was helpless. It was, and is, the victim of Wall Street bankers who had long ago lost their American identity by their huge foreign investments and who drive the American people to any sacrifices, even to wars, to protect those investments.

Arthur Kitson, whose work “The Bankers Conspiracy” was suppressed, said in “Trade Fallacies” concerning the collapse of 1929:

“As in England so in the United States the Government came to the rescue. The generosity of the government saved the banks as usual, at public expense. The entire credit of the nation was placed at the disposal of the banks, which enabled them to open their doors, resume business and avoid receivership...”

The present banking business of this country (England) which is practically a monopoly (as in the United States), is an extremely lucrative one, and is due to the special privileges granted by law....”

This Act of international financial intrigue may be summarized as follows: The time, late 1929; the location, Wall Street; the plot, strangulation of national financial resources; directed by greed; produced by withdrawal of billions of ledger money, the cast, a small group of international cut-throats who went unpunished.

William Lemke, Congressman from North Dakota, rightly said of this panic:

"This panic was caused by men. It is within the comprehension of men, can be analyzed and solved by men, can be remedied and relieved by men."

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President in 1932, while the nation was at its lowest ebb. Never before in America's history did a man have such an opportunity to demonstrate statesmanship. The nation was behind him more unanimously than it was ever behind one man before. The course was all his without interference; he had but to lead, all America was ready to follow. It was with great enthusiasm and a burning hope that the author pondered his words:

"Sixty families in America control the wealth of the nation... One-third of the nation's population is ill-housed, ill-fed and ill-clad... I intend to drive the money changers from the Temple."

But he did not. The banking acts passed under the "New Deal" further entrenched the money changers' power and increased the profits of the international manipulators of money.

The Banking Act of 1933 legislated that all earnings of the Federal Reserve Banks must by law go to the banks themselves. Before this time the U. S. Government was supposed to participate in the distribution of profits. This Act made the debts (bonds) of the United States the sole basis for issuance of private Federal Reserve Notes.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created by the same enactment. This purposely misled innocent depositors. It caused us all to believe that our Government guarantees all our deposits up to \$5000 per individual account. The fact is, however, that the amount of insurance money subscribed by the Government is only \$150 million. This cannot possibly guarantee bank deposits of almost \$15,000,000,000. It is just one hundred times short of that goal. The real purpose of this bureau is probably to give the internationalists the excuse to arbitrarily examine most closely the status of the nation's financial activities.

The Gold Bill of 1934 was a masterpiece of financial infamy. People were told the country was nationalizing gold. All gold was taken under penalty from every citizen in the nation and given to the Federal Reserve Banks to whom it now belongs.

Congressman Wright Patman said in a speech in Congress, after bank note currency was made lawful money and the gold and gold certificates were taken out of circulation:

"The bankers have had every scheme they can possibly visualize, that will enable them to exploit the citizens, enacted into law, except to be allowed to distribute among themselves the surplus funds in the Federal Reserve banks. They will likely slip this over in the future."

A silver provision in this bill gave the President authority to provide for the unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio fixed by such terms and conditions as he may desire. Actually, Roosevelt used this to injure rather than help the people: It has permitted internationalists to sell silver and receive payment in gold through the Stabilization Fund. Silver was drawn out of China to force the Chinese to use Bank of England paper notes as a base for their money.

The Banking Act of 1935 gave full voice in management to the Federal Reserve Board. The member banks (the real owners of the system because they have all its stock) have nothing to say in deciding the policies of the system and must follow the dictates of the board. Furthermore the central Federal Reserve Banks are permitted to loan directly to industry, thereby going into competition with its member banks whose money was paid into the capital stock of the Federal Reserve Banks.

The Stabilization Fund has been kept a mystery as far as its functions were concerned. When the extension of this Bill came up for debate in the Senate in 1936, our elected Senators were unable to get any information about the measure from the Secretary of the Treasury. The Bill was jammed through in sort of a "vote of confidence" fashion. However, a British economist speaking at the University of Pennsylvania praised the stabilization fund in operation between England and the United States. He said that while the operations were conducted in secret, they were returning huge profits, a large part of which had been given the Bank of England in the form of gold (When the United States arbitrarily raised the price of gold to a highly inflated price of \$35 an ounce, it all came back to America at another profit to the Bank of England. This government buried the gold in a hole in Kentucky.) It takes a British visitor to tell us of the benefits of the stabilization fund. The principal objection is that the benefits went to England at American expense when Americans were so badly in need of a few benefits and were led to believe "our great president" was giving us a few. The stabilization fund was used to stabilize the English pound, and later the French franc, but not the American dollar.

Winston Churchill says Roosevelt was greater than Washington or Lincoln. His judgment is not without bias, however. Washington and Lincoln whipped hell out of the English and their schemes, while Roosevelt gave the "*blood, sweat and tears*" of this nation (to say nothing of money) that England might continue to enslave her far flung Empire without competition from Germany. Churchill only measures one's greatness by what he does for England and there is no argument against the fact that Roosevelt was the best President Britain, the deadbeat Empire, ever had.

The disease of, acting for Europe first to our own disadvantage is probably the strangest and most inexplicable perverted psychosis ever to hypnotize a free nation Its origin is easily traced to the machinations of international finance. It might have supplanted the natural sense of patriotism when international finance converted F. D. R. who held the nation captive through the medium of hero worship rather than accomplishments. Placing one's faith in a man is dangerous but most people would hesitate to say it is that dangerous.

Many Republicans espoused the same heresy but not before Roosevelt made it popular, nor before those financial interests Roosevelt echoed began naming Republican as well as Democratic candidates. For that matter, Democrats were some of the first and loudest voices in nominating Willkie and Dewey for the Republicans. They could then turn around and make fun of the ridiculous "me too" philosophy of the Republican candidates.

The placing of faith in principles rather than men can lead to goals far apart. The author knows from personal experience. When Franklin Roosevelt took office this writer ardently placed his faith in the program of driving the money changers from the temple—not in Roosevelt because it was his program. As long as Roosevelt supported that principle of rectifying our financial ills the author was a Roosevelt man. When the President proceeded in exactly opposite directions from those he pledged himself to follow, this writer, because he pinned his credence in principles, still favored driving the money changers from the temple which was at opposite ways from those of the President. Had he placed his faith in this man Roosevelt he would have ended up being an ardent internationalist propagandist—far from the course pursued in this work.

It was tragic that the internationalist tenets of Franklin D. Roosevelt were not buried under in the landslide defeat they received when he ran for Vice President with Cox as the Presidential candidate in 1920. It looked at that time as if the Internationalist control of America was buried forever in spite of over 1000 speeches Roosevelt made in favor of international intervention in the campaign of 1920. It was this display which made him the darling of the big bankers who waited until the voters' memory was allayed to bring him forth from under their wraps as their champion twelve years later at a well-timed strategic moment.

It is hoped that some day in the near future the full story of financial interests in the formation of monopolies will be told. The monopoly of monopolies is the private control over money. It is the magic key that permits all other monopolies.

Senator Borah of Idaho once inserted in the Congressional Record the following list compiled from data secured from the Federal Trade Commission:

"In banking, 1 percent of the banks control 89 percent of the resources of this country. In matches, two companies dominate the field. In moving pictures, three companies dominate the field. In natural gas three companies

dominate the field. In electric power, four groups dominate the field. In bread, four companies have 25 percent of production. In meat packing, two companies have 50 percent of production. In steel, nine companies have 80 percent of mill capacity, of which United States Steel has 40 percent. In glass, four companies dominate production. In sulphur, two companies control all the production. In rubber, four companies dominate the field. In anthracite coal, eight companies produce 80 percent of the total tonnage in the country. In farm implements, International Harvester has 50 percent of the United States production. The Ford and General Motors Companies have 75 percent of the United States auto production. The International Nickel Company owns 90 percent of the world reserves. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company owns 80 percent of the United States telephone service. The Western Union Company owns 75 percent of the United States telegraph service. The United States Steel Corporation owns 75 percent of the iron ore reserves in the United States.

Five percent of the water power companies control 75 percent of developed water power. Five percent of the anthracite companies own 78 percent of all recoverable tonnage. Five percent of bituminous companies own 60 percent of all recoverable tonnage. Five percent of iron and steel companies own 95 percent of the iron ore reserves in the country. Five percent of the copper companies own 55 percent of the copper reserves. Five percent of the petroleum companies own 50 percent of the petroleum reserves. Five percent of the mining companies produce 60 percent of all mine products. Five percent of manufacturing companies produce 65 percent of the value of manufactures. Five percent of the wholesale establishments do 45 percent of all wholesale business. Five percent of the retail establishments do 45 percent of all retail business. Five percent of all corporations receive 86 percent of all corporate income. Five percent of all corporations own 77 percent of all corporate assets."

No wonder that far-seeing patriot, Thomas Jefferson, made the prophetic statement:

"If the American people ever allow private banks to issue their money, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and the large corporations that will grow up around them will deprive them of all their property, and their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered."

Justice Louis D. Brandeis made another valuable contribution to truth and knowledge when he wrote:

"The dominant element in our financial oligarchy is the investment banker. Associated banks, trust companies and life insurance companies are his tools. Controlled railroads, public service and industrial corporations are his subjects. Through properly put middlemen, these bankers bestride as masters America's business world, so that practically no large enterprise can be undertaken successfully without their participation or approval. These bankers are, of course, able men possessed of large fortunes; but the most potent factor in their control of business is not the possession of extraordinary ability or huge wealth. The key to their power is Combination—concentration intensive and comprehensive—advancing on three distinct lines:

First: There is the obvious consolidation of banks and trust companies; the less obvious affiliations—through stockholdings, voting trusts and interlocking directorates—of banking institutions which are not legally connected; and the joint transactions, gentlemen's agreements, and "banking ethics" which eliminate competition among the investment bankers.

Second: There is the consolidation of railroads into huge systems, the large combinations of public service corporations and the formation of industrial trusts, which by making businesses so "big" that local, independent banking concerns cannot alone supply the necessary funds, has created dependence upon the associated New York bankers.

But combination, however intensive, along these lines only, could not have produced the Money Trust—another and more potent factor of combination was added.

Third: Investment bankers, like J. P. Morgan & Co., dealers in bonds, stocks and notes, encroached upon the functions of the three other classes of corporations with which their business brought them into contact. They became the directing power in railroads, public service and industrial companies, through which our great business operations are conducted—the makers of bonds and stocks. They became the directing power in the life insurance companies, and other corporate reservoirs of the people's savings—the buyers of bonds and stocks. They became the directing power also in banks and trust companies—the depositories of the quick capital of the country—the life blood of business, with which they and others carried on their operations. Thus four distinct functions, each essential to business, and each exercised, originally, by a distinct set of men, became united in the investment banker. It is to this union of business functions that the existence of the Money Trust is mainly due."

The words of Pope Pius XI therefore stand out as bold and unshakable as Truth itself. He wrote:

"It (concentration of power) leads to a threefold struggle. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself (sometimes called the monopolization of industry.) Second, there is the struggle to acquire control of the nation, so that its wealth and political power may be abused in the economic circle. Thirdly, there eventuates international warfare."

Chapter VI

More Worlds to Conquer

“Financiers took upon themselves, perhaps not the responsibility, but certainly the power, of controlling the markets of the world and therefore the numerous relationships between one nation and another, involving international friendships or mistrusts.”

That is part of the “deathbed” repentance of a former Governor of the Bank of England, Vincent Cartwright Vickers. Before leaving the Bank of England to see how the Money Trust conquered other lands besides England and America, some facts on the flood of current propaganda concerning the so-called socialization of the Bank of England are solely needed and long overdue.

Life magazine, a straw which indicates the current of contemporary wind, admits:

“The bank retains its old powers of issuing British currency, managing the national debt and controlling credit and exchange. It has been given the new powers of investigating and dictating the policies of joint stock or commercial banks. This permits the bank to mold Britain’s economic future since commercial banks by giving or withholding credit control the lifeblood of business and industry.”

This is indeed a rare statement of truth to be found in a national publication, even if it is substantially the same material as can be found in that standard authority, the Americana Encyclopedia. Then the article continues:

“But in return the bank has lost its greatest power, which was its independence. Now a controlled arm of the government, it cannot, as it was accused of doing in 1931 to Labor, cause a government to fall by withholding credits to the Treasury. Nor can it pursue an international policy at odds with that of the Foreign Office, which the bank had done on many past occasions.”

The latter quotation is purely puerile propagandistic prattle. If this Bank of England retains the power of issuing currency, controlling credit and exchange, as “Life” correctly says it does, then this Bank is still independent and can, in keeping with the wisdom of its founder’s philosophy, cause government to fall and enforce foreign policies at odds with those of the Foreign Office. No one who knows the Bank of England has been ruling the British government since 1664 with gradually increased power is so naive as to suppose

that this bank would now suddenly allow its independence to be usurped by an outside force without at least one good big war.

The Labor government in Britain merely added the last detail to make the Financial Fascism in England complete. The Act exchanged bank stock for government stock! And at the astonishing level of \$4 hundred for each \$1 hundred share value Dalton said significantly:

"The Bill brings the long established and intimate relations between the bank and the Treasury into a legal state and makes clear where ultimate responsibility rests. The government is satisfied and the stockholders should be."

The Bank of England stockholders still get their usual 12 % under the Socialist regime, although stockholders of other institutions are not allowed percentages approaching that figure. True to the same old banking principles, bankers who create nothing but debts and panics are better than the industrialists who create goods and services.

Moreover, the Bank of England Act does not name the present owners of the bank stock, thereby keeping a secret which has been maintained ever since the Rothschilds first bought the major portion of the stock sold. The issue of money is still based on debt, instead of national wealth, and comes into circulation as a debt to the nation. This is the real power by which international finance controls the world.

The English writer, H. T. Mills rightly says:

"From the point of monetary reform the change (to Socialization) means nothing."

"Cavalcade," a newspaper of London, August 25, 1945, writes:

"Our opinion on this so-called 'nationalization' of the Bank of England is fully confirmed by the news that London City editors have already dismissed the proposed nationalization of the Bank of England as not even a 'palace revolution'. The Bank having been an instrument of national policy for so long, the change, it is insisted, is a nominal one only, involving little more technical than 'fair compensation' to Bank shareholders."

Maybe the English Socialists do not dare endanger the existence of the international bankers after the terrible experience Germany had with her challenge.

The reason for this "socialization" is because the control of finance and credit makes easier the takeover of other industries as found in a Socialistic State.

The Old Lady of Threadneedle Street, as the Bank of England is frequently called, is still a privately owned structure of the government with its capital privately held, and its

management no way directly or indirectly controlled by the State. It is now more securely than ever protected by the State. It is sovereign in its own right, and over and above the laws of England—a status admittedly attained by bribing dishonest officials of the British Isles through the years to gradually extinguish the freedom and rights of the people.

News dispatches openly admit that the Bank of England is the real source of British requests for more loans and the all-time effrontery high of Bevin's philosophy of *"let's you and I share what you have"* in the proposal that the United States pass out its Fort Knox gold to the world. Great Britain has the world's greatest gold deposits in South Africa, yet it would be considered unfriendly to suggest she get her gold from her own territory with her own labor.

... The gold at Fort Knox was largely sent to Europe at a cheap price and purchased by America at the inflated price of \$35 an ounce. This did two things: (1) Gave Europeans more dollars at America's expense, (2) Reduced foreign debts to America by greatly raising the value of European gold upon which international exchanges are based. Now the bankers want it passed out to the world so America can do the same things over again. If Bevin had kept his mouth shut they probably would have succeeded immediately. Now they will have to wait until things quiet down and then slip it over sub-rosa.

The Bank of France, the Reichsbank of Germany, and the banks of many other nations, all became other branch banks of the International Axis. With England and America, two of the most influential units on the globe because of their commerce, natural resources and far-flung possessions, in the hands of private bankers, the banking policies of other nations became affected with the very beginning.

Professor Usher stated in his Pan-Germanism of 1913:

"Russia, Turkey, Egypt, India, China, Japan and South America are probably owned, so far as any nation can be owned in London or Paris. Payment of interest on these vast sums is secured by the pledging of the public revenues of these countries, and, in the case of the weaker nations, by the actual delivery of the perception into the hands of the agents of the English and French bankers. In addition, a very large share, if not the major part, of the stocks and industrial securities of the world are owned by those two nations and the policies of many of the world's enterprises dictated by their financial heads."

He continues:

"The world itself, in fact, pays them tribute; it actually rises in the morning to earn its living by utilizing their capital, and occupies its days in making the money to pay them interest, which is to make them still wealthier."

Since that date in 1913 the American branch of the international banking system, the Federal Reserve Bank, has large stakes abroad. It is the hand that helped guide the course of nations in their humiliating cycle—World War, overthrow of governments, worldwide economic debacle, World War.

Leon Henderson aptly wrote:

"The international bankers of the Rothschild Bleichroeder-Warburg-Mendelssohn group set up Communism in Russia, National Socialism in Germany, Fascism in Italy; totalitarianism in Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, and Estonia; authoritarianism in Mexico and South America; economic planning in Britain and France, as economic and social instruments to repudiate debts owed to America and to salvage losses which they sustained in prosecuting war for these nations."

Germany

The inflation of the German mark after the war has been held up as the horrible example of what will happen in the United States if we permit any increase in our volume of money, even if it be at the direction of the Government. But the entire catastrophe of postwar Germany was directed by the private international bankers with their insane increase of Reichsbank notes—an increase which, at one time stood the mark at the astronomical sum of 35 hundred billions to the dollar.

The Reichsbank was itself independent and held directly responsible for the debacle. It was controlled by private individuals and not by the Government. From 1919 to the ascendancy of Adolph Hitler this bank was engineered by international forces. Their power had become such that they had the banking laws of Germany so changed as to enable them to borrow unlimited amounts with the assurance that the loans would not have to be paid. But when they destroyed the German mark, they destroyed all the mortgages, insurance policies, and other obligations to the German people. It was the suffering population that took the rap for the profit of a few ... shysters.

After the war, Germany had to pay her debts to the Allies, not in their own paper, but in gold. Yet that same iniquitous treaty took practically all her gold from her. It was physically impossible under the set-up that the debt could ever be paid. Furthermore, she was deprived of the resources of her prospering colonies which were taken away. Her foreign trade was next to nothing and her foreign investments confiscated. Germany owed a huge debt to her banks, and another to the Allies. All this was her lot while being rendered as helpless as the spiteful authors of the Versailles Treaty could make her. They thought they were putting Germany in her place for all times to come.

They were so blinded by their unreasonable hatred that they could not see that they were breeding some Hitler who would someday overthrow their financial status quo and use German means to make Germany powerful once more. The man Hitler was only incidental. It could have been any lowly crackpot skilled in mob tactics—the man's name just happened to be Hitler.

After forcing their demands on Germany, the Allies could not allow their squirming victim to repudiate her debt to them. Nor would the German banks allow the Government to repudiate her debt to them; that would have started a run that would have broken possibly every bank in the nation. No Government can ever afford to let her banks fail. This fact, together with the propaganda that such an event would turn the country over to Communism, prevented the repudiation.

The German Government did her best to pay reparations to the Allies, so much so that there was no money with which to pay interest to the banks. The banks could only be paid by further borrowings from the banks. These loans in turn had to be paid plus the accumulating interest. This was a vicious circle which necessitated still more borrowing for an ever increasing debt until the loans by the banks far outran their ability to redeem. This was the real inflation, the consequent rise in prices and the fall of the mark.

The Reparations Committee cared nothing about the value of the mark. The debt Germany owed them was entirely distinct from that which Germany owed her banks. This was the appropriate time for the international buzzards, the foreign financiers, to step in. They put at the disposal of the German Government various credits in Allied countries. By handing these over to the Allied Governments, an obligation to the international bankers would be created. That accounted for the Dawes loan of 800 million gold marks which Lloyd George later admitted was dictated by international bankers. Thus the Allies began to find themselves no longer creditors of Germany. To their profound chagrin they found this role was now assumed by their more powerful masters, the international financiers.

"Again, for the third time, Germany is threatening to sink in the sea of insolvency with all her creditors on board; and again it is the creditors who frantically work at the pumps. Their anxiety seems greater than Germany's own, and it is, for the singular reason that in this sea only creditors can drown. If Germany sinks, she will rise again, lightened by the loss of her creditors.

Twice the creditors, unable otherwise to keep her afloat, have cast overboard great parcels of debt, and that at first was easy to do because the debt was political. The name of it was reparations. But now, in this third crisis, there are two kinds of debt and two kinds of creditors on board, all in the same dilemma. There is what survives of the original reparations debt, and there is

now, besides, an enormous private debt, owing not by the German Government to other governments but owing by the German Government, by all the German states, by German municipalities, by German banks, by German industry to private lenders all over the world. This is new debt, created in the past six or seven years. The amount of it is more than \$3,500,000,000. Two-thirds of it is owing to American banks, American investors, American lenders."

This was from the pen of Garet Garrett, writing in the Saturday Evening Post in 1931.

The Dawes Plan found that in spite of the wildest inflation in the world's history, Germany was sound and good for a substantial loan to establish a tide of confidence. Once afloat it could bear a reparations debt burden of \$625 million a year. On the undertaking to make it work the German Government borrowed \$200 million gold from Great Britain, France and the United States, to begin a policy of fulfillment. Then, immediately, Germany at large launched herself upon a career of borrowing. This was the beginning of the private debt. Five years later the Dawes Plan was failing.

Mr. Lloyd George, himself a friend of the International Banker, once wrote:

"The International Bankers dictated the Dawes reparation settlement. The Protocol which was signed "between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany is the triumph of the International financier.

Agreement would never have been reached without the brusque and brutal intervention of the International Bankers. They swept statesmen, politicians and journalists to one side and issued their orders with the infuriousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees.

The settlement is the joint Ukase of King Dollar and King Sterling. Dawes' report was theirs. They inspired and fashioned it. The Dawes report was fashioned by the Money Kings. The orders of German financiers to their politicians were just as peremptory as those of the allied bankers to their political representatives."

Then a second committee of international experts made an analysis of her resources and said she could afford to pay only \$400 million a year. That was the Young Plan; and on the undertaking to make that plan work, the German Government borrowed \$300 million from Great Britain, France and the United States to launch itself upon a second policy of fulfillment.

Such were the circumstances under which President Hoover proposed an international debt holiday. No reparations to be collected by the former Allies from Germany, no

payments to be made by Europe on account of war debts to the United States Treasury, for a period of one year. The effect of this was a loan of \$400-million to Germany. That was the amount she would have had otherwise to pay away on account of reparations. And besides that effect, international finance at the same time made a direct loan of \$100-million to the German Reichsbank to meet any emergency. The money was provided by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the Bank of England and the Bank of France. On this day's work international finance heaved a great sigh. Nothing less than the bankruptcy of Germany had been averted. For several days there was a wonderful rise in German bonds, in securities of all kinds, even in commodities, the whole world over.

Frequent demands for the cancellation of war debts were heard. This reversal of policy by the bankers was quite convenient. If the Allies are to be their rivals in presenting bills for payment, the chance of the money men collecting are greatly reduced. Behind the great humanitarian and noble-soured principles with which the ears of the multitudes were charmed, the only reason for the propaganda for the cancellation of the war debts was due to that one cause. By the Hoover moratorium the debts were suspended; and by the Lausanne Agreement they were abolished.

The victory for the international clan was thus completed. Had the oppressive conditions it brought not bred a Hitler to overthrow this victory, there would never have been a World War II.

Russia

Every page of the downfall of Imperial Russia with the revolution and usurpation of Bolshevism is sordid with the activities of International Bankers. The origin of the internationalist's hatred for Imperial Russia goes back, perhaps, to the Civil War in America. It was Russia which prevented England from sending troops into the South on which the bankers had bet their money. Following that incident written records, letters and memoirs show that the powers with the earth for their gambling board were bitter and bold in professing their supreme hatred for Russia.

From a letter to Lord Rothschild in England during the Russo-Japanese question in 1904 not only the hatred, but also the power, of these practitioners of plunder is manifest. These phrases speak for themselves: *"Induce the American department of State . . . all the influence we could command . . . ask the American Government to officially inform Russia . . . induce the British Government . . ."* These are all found in a letter written by the American financier, Jacob Schiff, senior member of Kuhn-Loeb and Company of New York, to Lord Rothschild of London.

The setting up of totalitarian states under dictatorial governments is a favorite trick of the money masters for saddling national and international debts on the citizens of "creditor nations." By changing the form of the government in these nations, the money masters

repudiate all debts which they contracted through the former government. When a nation is bankrupt its money aristocracy simply reorganizes the government.

Thus, the American citizenry, forced to pay taxation to compensate for defaulted bonds, sustains the loss effected by changes of government in Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy and various nations of South America, and by the consequent repudiation of out. standing indebtedness.

It is significant that the original backers of Hitler were the very same as those who financed Lenin and Trotsky in Russia. They loaned money to wage war, sold their munitions and instruments of murder, and subsidized saboteurs and revolutionists to overturn institutional government.

Not only was the American Government involved in their plot, but they steadfastly refused to tender a loan to the Russian Empire. Russia would have used the loan to improve her vast agricultural acreage and her huge mineral potentialities. This would have prevented the rise of revolutionaries and the Red riders of ruination.

Meanwhile the loans made to other European nations were being consumed, not in the constructive needs of a better social order as would have been the case in Russia, but in a bigger and better armaments race. Nearly all the munitions factories were controlled at least indirectly by the international money men who at times deliberately precipitated military adventures for personal profit; every man murdered meant their precious products were being used. One of these bankers financed the Japanese in their war against Russia. Not only that, but he even delved into the unprecedented and incredible depths of intrigue by financing revolts among the Russian war prisoners in Japan.

In 1916 the Russian headquarters for the revolt received a report from a secret meeting of supporters in New York saying that the most serious problem, that of finance, had the interest of a high ranking banker in America. Immediately connected with his firm was a Mr. Warburg, a leading American banker, who represented the German Foreign Office in a meeting with Russian representatives in Stockholm in 1916.

This could only have been done by design. They deliberately and secretly plotted the overthrow of the Imperial Government and, by means of the revolution, repudiated the debts of the old regime to escape payment, and set up a system over which they had control. It followed the favorite pattern of the money powers. First, national bankruptcy, then social revolution, then repudiation of debts. It is illuminating to most of us to know that it is the American investor and taxpayer that carries most of the loss of revolutions no matter where they occur, and the subsequent repudiation of debts to America.

In 1919 a certain ... banker of New York delivered a lecture at an international dinner in Buda-Pesth. In reply to a question asking how it was possible for high finance to favor Bolshevism? which is hostile to property, movable and immovable, this banker began by

explaining that the ... nation is the most national of all peoples and that Marxism is simply one of the weapons of its nationalism. Capitalism, he added, is equally sacred. The process of world rule is thus carried on from above by control of world goods and from below by the guidance of revolutions. An English writer, H. T. Mills, says:

"She (Russia) is entirely dominated by the monetary power, which in the first instance gave to Bolshevism the possibility of life."

John K. Turner states in "Shall It Be Again" says:

"Our illegal war in Russia was pleasing not only to Paris and London bankers, but to New York bankers as well"

Mr. Lamont, a partner of Morgan, was permitted to send an advance copy of the peace conditions to his Wall Street associates. While acting for the American people at Paris, Lamont participated in the organization of the China Consortium and the International Convention of Bankers on Mexico. So, along with the peace arrangements we find the beginnings of the *"definite plan of international cooperation in the financing of foreign enterprises,"* advanced by Pres. Farrell of the U. S. Steel Corporation, a year before.

When the Russian Empire had been supplanted by the ruthless might of a bloody state dictatorship, it was expected that all financing for that country would be done through the Soviet State Bank. But the dictatorship even took over the State Bank by the favorite method of the firing squad. Whenever things went wrong in the central bank, and they too frequently did, it was up to the OGPU, Russian secret police, to implicate someone and shoot him on suspicion of being a Trotskyist counter-revolutionary or some other first class version of a scapegoat....

These powers care no more for the misfortune of Europe than they did for the slavery of India and the poverty and wretchedness of China in previous years. They care no more for those behind the iron curtain than they did for those behind the Gold curtain. They don't even care for the fate of America. They are perfectly willing for the United States to become thoroughly Socialized so long as they do the Socializing.

France

How the International Bankers branched into France is another perfect example of what the power of money utilized by the unscrupulosity of those possessed by its toxin can do. First, they had to discredit the monarchy of France. Insane financial abuses directed by the notorious Necter soon wearied a starving people to the point of revolt. During the revolution in 1793, the existing French money was destroyed by huge volumes of similar money printed in England and sold to puppets who passed it into the flow of French currency. It

is said that seventeen presses and four hundred men were employed in England for the counterfeiting of money which was designed to ruin the honest money of France. From that time onward the money and most of the property of France was in the direction of the only strategists for which England is famous.

Napoleon knew what the bankers were up to all the while they were moving into position. They were gathering a reward on goods sold in France—even on the English topcoats which Napoleon's troops wore on their invasion into Russia. Later, Napoleon retaliated with a levy on goods imported into France: He was the first to use the weapon of the levy. The British navy carried out the financiers design by preventing supplies from reaching Italy, through which Napoleon was to transport them to his forces in Russia. That is the untold story of the famous military leader's defeat on the vast devastated snow-covered plains.

The Bank of France was founded just seven years after the start of the French Revolution, in 1800. It wielded the power of issuing all the money for the country and by means of that privilege placed an undignified tombstone on the freedom and independence of France from that day to this.

Each of the rapid succession of French Governments lived on a bank overdraft, being a line of implements in the hands of the Regents of the Bank of France. When Leon Blum was successful in overthrowing the office of Regents and established what he was pleased to call a Nationalization of banking, it was only a plain variety of window dressing such as is seen in England at the present time. The Government still had to borrow money from the Bank of France, and could borrow only so much as the private bankers who operated the institution deigned to permit the Government to have.

The Bank of France owned or controlled the leading manufacturers of France. It reached outside the country and took the dominating share in the Skoda munitions factories of Czechoslovakia—Hitler's principle objective in annexing the territory. While France, or rather her banks, ran the world's largest munitions concern, France refused to deliver machine guns to Portugal for fear they would get into the hands of the Spanish fictitiously-labeled Rebels for use against the Communist so-called Loyalists....

Spain

The fact that Spain succumbed to the power of the ubiquitous and omniscient money artists is but another proof of the universal might of finance and the treacherous forces which manipulate it.

International financiers became interested in Spain before the year 1840. The Rothschilds were anti-Carlist in the war of succession because they feared that the success of Don Carlos would mean that they would lose the famous Almaden quicksilver mines. By a bear operation on the stock exchange the Rothschilds sent Spanish securities tum-

bling down. The Prime Minister was forced to resign, and the Rothschilds realized a profit far beyond the amount of the bribe they had previously given him: A hot tip from Nathan Rothschild when the Rothschilds decided to bring the slump, bought his successor.

Spain is rich in mineral resources which have been exploited by foreign capital when exploited at all. Great amounts of money went out each year in the form of dividends to foreign investments. These speculations also caused a great amount of imports for Spain.

General de Rivera on his accession to power saw that foreign capital was pouring into the country at a dangerously rapid rate. The Spanish national debt was small due to her neutrality in World War I. The efficiency of the Spanish Government in managing its own financial affairs further freed it from the ravages of the war's aftermath. Consequently de Rivera refused all offers of loans. Instead, he embarked upon a policy of vigorous economic nationalism. Foreign goods were excluded by a high tariff. Foreign capital, mostly from the United States and France, was checked. Spanish capital was governed from a central Government-owned bank. Increased activity in agriculture and industry was pursued.

Spain prospered. Foreign powers were no longer hauling away her treasures. She was dependent on neither the gold standard nor on foreign loans and goods. She did not have to fall in line with the other nations of the continent and suffer the miseries of disastrous inflation. Her price level remained regular. The nations who owed Spain found their debts increased by half due to their state of unstable price levels. General de Rivera persisted in maintaining that where a ton of mineral had been borrowed, a ton of mineral should be paid back. He refused to allow any debt repudiation.

Such staunch common sense policies greatly irritated the powers of finance controlling the other major nations. But they had to use their best diplomacy on this man de Rivera. After a time the hissing of these serpents persuaded him to reach for a big ripe apple. A loan was to be accepted from English and American bankers. His successor negotiated another loan from J. P. Morgan. The price these men wanted was deflation. Because they could not pay the price, the Spanish leaders, and later the monarchy, fell.

When the Republicans came in, the Bank of Spain negotiated a loan of about one thousand million francs from French financiers, or the French branch of the international cartel. The loan was covered by a gold guarantee which was deposited with the Bank of France at Mont de Marsan. The conditions of that loan have never been made public.

According to the latest figures available, J. P. Morgan held about \$67-million of the \$100-million of American capital invested in Spain. Americans would do well to remember this if they wish to know the truth behind the deception.... The international money powers and the large banks of Spain with their gold reserve were trying to beat Franco. These banks were in the hands of the "Loyalists" and made the financial guarantee of the Franco Nationalists difficult because their bills had no gold backing. The Bank of Spain, of course, refused

to be responsible for the “rebel” bills. Let all who believe the late Spanish war was waged by fascists for the benefit of fascists ponder those incontrovertible facts! That the Communists whose cause was espoused by high finance did not beat Franco is not the fault of the banks.

Franco was saved only by a fundamental principle of sound finance. Because his money was backed up by the wealth of the country, and not by gold, his peseta was quoted at 1.75 francs while the “Loyalists” peseta was scarcely quoted at all, so ridiculously low was its value and so rarely was it accepted. This has been the story of how Spain was taken in and how she regained her independence. But the continuance of the events up to the present show the banks are again trying to subjugate her.

Shortly after Franco was established as leader of the new Spanish Government he was granted a \$13,750,000 loan by the United States State Department. It was called here an effort to help American interests. That means, in straight language, the financial status of the privately owned branch banks of Spain. The branch of the National City Bank was closed because of the Spanish Government’s refusal to allow its officials to return. But here’s the joker in the deal. The loan was put up by various New York banking houses, but the Government Import-Export bank is held responsible. In other words, if Franco doesn’t pay off the loan, the private bankers won’t lose — they just collect from Uncle Sam. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose, but Uncle Sam, the taxpayers, stand to lose plenty and gain nothing.

The present Spanish situation in UN distinctly bears the trade mark “Made in Moscow” and proceeds because of the spineless attitude of the putty-headed One World American delegation which, failing in buying unity, will have it by heaping concession upon concession to those who keep coming back for more of the same. The fact that no one in UN dared mention the Soviet bloody intervention in the Spanish Civil War and to accuse the present Communist regimes in Europe as the only real danger for peace today, gave all the trump cards to the Soviet bloc. In this light they succeeded in presenting Franco as the only remnant of dictatorship in the world, an arch-criminal who summoned Nazi and Fascist troops to crush true democracy in his country, helped the Axis win the war, and is now the only exception in a world of freedom and justice.

This is not the issue of Spain alone, but another field of conflict between the “democracies” and Russia. Britain is interfering in internal Spanish affairs for the purpose of restoring the monarchy in Spain. The British design to give Don Juan to Spain as king has the obvious tangible advantage of fixing Spain in the British orbit, and reinforcing Britain’s shaky sway in the Mediterranean. As usual, the British are pursuing an ulterior course.

The battle between Britain and Russia for control of Spain explains most of the devious maneuvering that has gone on in the UN under the pious smoke-screen professions of horror about the Franco regime. The United Nations charter forbids any nation to interfere

in the domestic concerns of another state, but that does not deter the self-styled champions of peace from hijacking Spain for themselves. The United States threw the German consuls out of this country before the late war because of interfering in American affairs. Whatever they might have done, it was less brazen than recent admitted intervention in Spain.

Austria

So powerful were the international vultures in the finance of Austria that when the battleships with which she was to fight Italy in the preliminary skirmish of World Supremacy known as World War I, these battleships were called "Rothschild Dreadnaughts" by part of the European press. But when the fall of the Austrian crown came, it was the fall of Austria, not the fall of Rothschild.

The story is modeled on the same pattern as the tale of the German mark. It happened in almost the same way at almost the same time. While the crown was tottering between life and death, people continually crowded the windows of the money changers to get a glimpse of the health of the crown to see whether the flow of life had been upwards or downwards. Prices were posted in windows as each change developed.

To the people outside the condition of the crown was the same as the condition of their country. When the collapse came, the money they had saved was money lost. Many children were sent to England to overcome the effects of undernourishment. Many others, together with their mothers, worked at such jobs as brick making in order to keep alive.

When Germany invaded Austria and annexed it to the mother country, startling news in the world of money came from Austria. Baron Eugene de Rothschild, with headquarters in Paris, sued his own brother, Baron Louis von Rothschild, head of the Austrian banking establishment for \$3,500,000. This made great newspaper stories; but it so happened that the 3 1/2 million dollars was the exact amount the Parisian brother had on deposit when Germany absorbed Austria. It was merely a clever way to keep the money in the family and out of the hands of a potential enemy.

When Germany was to take over the banking house of Austria, she felt herself obligated only by the business relations which Germany herself had contracted. Thus the Rothschild deposit of Louis would have been lost unless brother Eugene could take it into safe keeping for him by suing for it. It was an act of brotherly love, not of brotherly antagonism as so many propaganda sheets reported.

The four Rothschild brothers established branch banks in four different European quarters—a circumstance which helped Baron Louis of Austria before. He was once held responsible for the failure of the largest bank in the Danube region in 1931. The fall of this bank caused the failure of many smaller banks. But by transferring his personal wealth to his brothers in Paris and London, he avoided his obligations.

To pull a still further trick on Germany the Rothschild agents in the United States, Kuhn, Loeb and Company, and the Bank of Manhattan Company, were served a writ of attachment for the money and securities which these firms held. This legal action automatically prevented transfer of the money held in the name of the Austrian concern, which Baron Louis headed, to the German Government. These powers gave Hitler his first defeat. For indemnification, the only thing the German Chancellor could do was to arrest the Baron, thereby causing a swell of "bloody anti-Semitism" to be hurled at him.

She was the last of the world's choice fruits to be plucked. Europe, Asia, Africa, the Orient and North America had all been brought in line. Now avaricious eyes turned to South America. Coffee from Brazil, tin from Bolivia, ore deposits in Chile, grain and cattle from Argentina made South America another treasure that would have to be captured and buried. Because she was so plundered is at least a large part of the story behind the unannounced fact that the 26 nation pledge against a separate armistice and peace with the Axis, signed at Washington January 1, 1942, did not contain a single important country in South America as a signatory!

Destruction of governments and the establishment and maintenance of others has been the continual procedure of the financial powers over South America. From the first American loan floated by J. P. Morgan to Mexico in 1899, through the loan to Santa Domingo in 1905, to Cuba in 1906 to Nicaragua in 1907, to Honduras in 1911, and later to Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and Columbia, this sinister fact stands out.

The United States has for years been trying to bribe the good will of South America from the Axis nations. Maybe the administration never heard of the English king who bribed the Danes. The only thing he accomplished was causing more Danes to come for more bribes. When bribes don't work America uses threats. Thus she staged a meeting of foreign ministers in Rio to have all the good neighbors sign their names to a pact dictated by our Banker-controlled State Department. Anyone who refused would suffer the Hitler technique of economic reprisals which, in this case, meant isolation.

On September 10, 1940, here was the record of our loans to South American countries and their payments.

Bolivia had \$60-million and was entirely in default.

Brazil had \$360-million and was entirely in default.

Colombia had \$146-million and was in default for all but three million.

Chile had \$182-million and was in default for the entire amount.

Costa Rica was in default for her entire commitment of \$8-million.

Cuba borrowed \$125-million and still owed \$42-million.

Ecuador received twelve million and owed twelve million.

Guatemala took five million and still owed three million.

Haiti was loaned eight million and owed the same.

Mexico had \$275-million and only owed \$273-million.

Panama took seventeen million and was in arrears on the full amount.

Peru was granted eighty-five million and was in default of the entire sum.

Uruguay benefited to the tune of fifty-five million and was in default of only five million of the original commitment.

Argentina had outstanding loans from America to the total of \$233-million but only about one-tenth was in default. Argentina was particularly incensed at America because the American Government has a habit of making everyone except the English respect the Monroe Doctrine. The English took two small islands off the eastern coast of Argentina. England has for so long and in so many places taken defenseless territories that it is overlooked. But not by Argentina, who protested frequently to no avail. She prints stamps showing these two islands as part of her nation. No wonder she is suspicious of treachery from the London-Washington axis.

U. S. power politics lately turned again to the Argentine, trying to influence elections there, interfering with the internal affairs of another nation in violation of the United Nations charter on the old Commie charge of "fascist." The mass of Argentine workers proved to be onto the Communist racket. They decided with Peron whom the American State Department tried to overthrow along with their Government.

Mexico. In 1922 it was realized that the real wealth of Mexico, really a Central American country, was in her expansive deposits of oil. And such an imaginary thing as a boundary line was not to keep the greed of finance from reaping to the full the benefits of the "liquid gold." Through the medium of propaganda and with the approval of President Wilson, Americans were erroneously led to believe that President Diaz of Mexico was a tyrant and dangerous to American institutions. Because of the integrity and efficiency of Huerta, who succeeded Diaz, Americans were pushed to great lengths to secure oil leases.

Secret ambassadors chose Madero to head a revolt in Mexico, promising help in return for the lakes of oil in lower California, Madero was an honest man and refused. But Wilson knew a way of getting oil leases. He raised the arms embargo in favor of two of the meanest and most treacherous scoundrels this continent has seen, Villa and Carranza.

In 1914 Wilson ordered the American navy to seize Vera Cruz which was the only port through which Huerta could obtain supplies for the defense of his cause from the enemies of everything sacred. This was a fatal blow. After the revolt was completed Wilson persuaded our nation to reverse itself on the Panama Canal tolls. Now American ships were taxed for the use of our own Canal in order to please England for the return favor of recognizing

the revolutionary government of Carranza. From that time on, American interests in Mexico have been a constant source of diplomatic relations between Mexico and the United States.

A few years ago a six point agreement between the United States and Mexico, hailed as “a milestone in the cause of solidarity” was another piece of dollar diplomacy featuring a gallant effort to buy the friendship of our neighbor across the Rio Grande. Under the terms of the agreement Mexico promises to pay the United States in full the \$40-million in so-called general and agrarian claims, although only \$3-million of the total was to be paid immediately.

In return the United States has made many costly commitments. The Administration has agreed to set up a fund of \$40-million for stabilization of the Mexican monetary system. The Administration has agreed to establish a \$30-million credit through the Export-Import Bank for the “*construction and developing of the Mexican national highways system*”. The Administration has agreed to negotiate a reciprocal trade treaty with Mexico, the chief purpose of which, apparently, is to relax American restrictions on imports of Mexican oil.

Finally, the document commits the United States to a program of purchasing 6-million ounces of newly mined silver monthly from the Mexican government. This commitment means that every year, as long as the agreement remains in force, the United States will provide Mexico with upwards of \$25-million in dollar exchange for metal that has no practical value as money and which will simply clutter up the vaults of the Treasury Department. Engineers in the Office of Production Management have suggested that some of the existing silver stock be used as a substitute for copper in electric wiring. That is how “valuable” the metal is as money.

Brazil, in one of the largest loans of an American finance company, received \$8-million of American depositors’ money for bonds due in thirty years bearing 7% interest. These were to electrify a railroad which never has and, in all probability, never will receive the benefits of electrification. More recently, the strength and importance of such loans came to light when the American Government in its usual capacity as tool of the money changers, agreed to aid the establishment of a Brazilian Central Reserve Bank. After a conference with Bernard Baruch, international banker and Wall Street spokesman, our Secretary of the Treasury agreed to sell Brazil up to \$60-million of gold for which America will make dollar exchange available to Brazil. By that deal the “powers that be” bought a portion of Brazil and by means of the dollar exchange have given themselves markets in this country for products raised by their interests in Brazil. The American farmer will suffer, perhaps to the extent of having the banks foreclose on his mortgage, but the bankers will have profitable markets in Brazil. The American farmer is a patient fellow and if he loses his farm the banks will have that, too. They win from both sides.

Colombia had American oil interests. When these were at stake the American State Department puppet-like took a hand again. A loan of \$20-million had been arranged by

the National City Bank of New York with the President of Colombia. Four million dollars were withheld until the demands of the American interests were met and the Barco oil concession was completely given over to Colombia.

The United States did not need oil because at the time her own fields in Texas and Oklahoma were being forced to close because of cheap South American oil produced with slave labor being shipped into the United States. To show how much the Government could do about it, we find the State Department giving information to the National City Bank of New York about the Barco oil concession. This same information was refused a Senate Investigation Committee.

Colombia saw in the proposed Latin America peace pact "*a Morgan-Rockefeller scheme to weld the chains of economic slavery permanently upon the countries of Latin-America*". She saw that the greed of foreign financiers wanted terms in the peace pact which would prevent South American countries from securing arms when it became necessary to overthrow a ruler. These wars would be dangerous to American investments. On the other hand, arms for their favorite rulers could be obtained from their financial associates as was done in Venezuela and Cuba.

It is for the benefit of the bankers that America refused to allow South American countries to arm and then threaten to leave them to the mercy of the horrible Nazis unless they sign a pact to sever all relations with Germany and Italy and depend solely on our heroic generosity. When the Nye Investigation Committee brought J. P. Morgan and du Pont to Washington to talk over these deals, the lords of finance said they would be exposed if the hearings continued. So they had the politicians in Washington to whom they contributed campaign funds see to it that the Senate refused to appropriate the funds necessary for the continuance of the investigation.

Bolivia. In 1922 a loan from United States Bankers bolstered a Bolivian Government in which the citizens had lost all respect and confidence. During the negotiations the press was completely muzzled. Those who knew and objected to the loan were deported or jailed. When another loan was agreed on in 1928 even the senators of the Bolivian Government were persecuted and confined for combating the borrowing. In this way foreign financiers helped oppressive governments remain in power and financially ruin the little nations. Many unworthy and thoroughly corrupt governments have been prolonged or rescued by finances from America. The burden of debts thus caused by the loans placed a burden on the people and was too often spent for purposes unproductive and sinister.

During the investigation in which much of the South American scandals were made known, sworn evidence was advanced to show that when one of the largest loans to Peru was made, the son of the President of Peru was bribed with five thousand dollars by an agent of the international bankers in order that the banks might have the privilege of mar-

keting some securities which time has shown to be as secure as quicksand. Debauchery in the Peruvian Government was long supported by a series of secret and unjustifiable loans.

Chile is another important South American country. It is only a hundred miles wide, but 2,620 miles long. It lies along the Western edge of the Andes mountains and therefore has mines numerous and excellent. Until nitrate was processed from air, 95 % of it came from Chile. About 70 % of the world's iodine comes from there as a by-product of nitrate. Chile is second in the world's supply of copper, and has huge reserves of 2 billion tons of coal. Agriculture is an important industry too.

Since an article written by Allen Haden for the Pittsburgh Press does a nice job telling of American exploitation in Chile and the consequent hostility towards the United States, let's allow him to tell the story in pretty much his own way.

A politician in Chile told Haden, "*We (meaning peddlers) cheat you in small things but for years you Yankees have been taking away our copper, nitrates, iodine, iron ore, with only small profit to Chile.*" The implication was that in big things the Yankees cheated them.

Chileans claim that investments of private capital from the United States which is used by Anaconda and Kennecott in copper mining, by the Guggenheim interests in nitrate mining, and by the Bethlehem Steel Company in mining iron ore, only gives Chile the wages paid to the laborer, the price of fuel consumed, import duties on machinery and parts imported. They claim that the profits go outside the country to Yankee shareholders, and that Chile does not profit from her riches.

The minister of Finance's report in October of 1940 to Congress states that of the \$40-million value of copper exports, only a little over \$13-million returned to Chile as exchange with which to pay for imports. This does not include the Government's 33 % share of the net profit of the copper company's operations. Thus the powers of the Import-Export banks do lots of exporting from Chile but do not help the importation very much. The good neighbor of Chile feels that her wealth is being plundered by American banking interests; that the big forks of the steam shovel are devouring the meat and leaving her the bone.

Venezuela. The corrupt U. S. power politicians working under the Good Neighbor policy inspired a revolution in Venezuela with lend-lease money from U. S. taxpayer's pockets. Shortly after this a U. S. announcement was made by the revolutionary government of new oil concessions to U.S. firms. This didn't get into the newspapers. American taxpayers also paid to keep it out of the press.

Americans despise all dictators, such as Hitler, Stalin, Franco. But they despise more, if possible, political sneaks and liars who smuggle arms and ammunition into a peaceful country to start civil war and to murder innocent people in order that the apostles of avarice might get a few more oil concessions.

India

A nationally known magazine in articles written by Ben Marcin give an authentic history of the tragedy of India. Reliable histories and books such as "The Way of the Aggressor" substantiate the awful truths.

India is a British colony but is almost as large in area as the United States and contains one fifth of the world's population. Her wealth and industry are many and great. They had long made India the envy of commercial pirates. In industry she led the world. The quality and beauty of her precious stones and pottery, her works in metals, her architectural and engineering feats, her great trade on land and sea, her large number of business men and capable financiers made her one of the most prosperous nations in the world. The prize was too large to pass up.

The wealthy House of Sassoon with the power of its riches, position and matrimonial affiliations among the British nobility and the Rothschild family, invaded highly civilized India. The privately owned British West India Trading Company owned, controlled and operated by the Sassoons, rented trading posts at Madras, Calcutta and Bombay. They fortified them in spite of contracts to the contrary. When the 146 British prisoners were taken as hostages merely to hold the Trading Company to its contract, plans went wrong and all but 23 of the prisoners died in what is now known as "The Back Hole of Calcutta."

This started a war in which the superior British armaments were easily victorious. Clive, the British General and employer of the Trading Company, led the forces that enabled the Sassoons to take over the most wealthy portion of India. The company prospered and paid such high dividends that its stock rose to the fantastic price of \$32,000 a share. But the British kept, and still keep, the population in shocking poverty and weakness principally through excessive taxation and the might of the sword.

When Britain first offered India "independence" the rest of the world was at a loss to see why India did not accept. The simple reason was that the offer of independence was merely political; Britain offered governmental control to India but kept all her stolen riches. India knows that political independence without economic independence means nothing. It only gives Britain an excuse to release a big batch of lies about her concern for the welfare of other nations—a release the bankers who rule Britain and the United States would make the American State Department and a kept press instruments in promulgating.

That India finally did accept "Independence" came only after long and numerous negotiations in which she struggled for the best bargain she could get and then accept it as the lesser of two evils. Surely no one will argue with the assertion that her liberty is far from the kind of which Patrick Henry spoke.

An investigation into the crimes of the early Trading Company resulted in its charter being revoked and the Government of India put into the hands of the English in India rather than at London. This means that the same international House of Sassoons, who hold a monopoly on opium traffic, rule and their old policies prevail. First, however, they forced the British Government to pay dearly for their charter rights supposedly relinquished—a charter that had paid for itself many times over. In addition, the price was added to the public debt of India to be redeemed principle and interest out of the taxes placed on the already exploited people.

Because of their marriage into the House of Rothschild, the Sassoons were given all the English finance they needed to perpetuate the gigantic swindle and history's most malodorous example of inhumanity in business practice.

If the Allies were really fighting for the “four freedoms everywhere” their own territory of India was a good place to give tangible evidence of their sincerity.

China

With the presentation of the oppression of the Orient by the lawless iniquity of international finance, nearly all the population of the world will have been portrayed as mere chattels of a few financial lords who are, like the masses they bleed, private individuals. China was once a relatively prosperous nation.... Certainly they used modern forms of money many centuries before the establishment of the Bank of England. Legend has it that paper money was used in China before the Christian era. Records show it to have been in use in the ninth century. In the fourteenth century records reveal that Chinese paper money was as good as gold. When the Ming dynasty came into power it issued paper money, but accepted only metal in payment of taxes, thereby concentrating silver and gold into its hands. Uncontrollable issues of paper money followed and the plague that ravished China brought on a disastrous inflation.

Then private bankers, those pirates of plutocracy, began their issuance of paper money, which together with copper, became the money of the country. Much of their gold and silver was used in the arts and the trades; now placed in sealed vaults where it is of no more use than it was as ore in the mountains. But when China traded with other nations she had to deal with their gold and silver dollars because their paper was often good only in the vicinity of the bank that issued it. Furthermore, paper money was so cheap that it took too much of it to allow the Chinese to obtain very many gold or silver dollars for use in foreign trade.

As early as 1905 American bankers were speculating in China where cheap labor would permit them to make more profits on manufactures produced there. Loans by bankers began in 1911. After World War I an international consortium was formed which would attend exclusively to all foreign financing to be undertaken in China. In this consortium

signed by individual bankers of various nations, America has more finance available for Chinese investment than has all the other banking houses put together. Thus American International bankers have a virtual domination of Chinese financing. America for Americans profits the bankers, but Asia for the Asiatics does not. Silver legislation in this country has injured China immeasurably. By our silver policy, this metal is bought from China with Bank of England paper notes which the Chinese are forced to use as a base for their money. At any fixed time this paper can be declared worthless and exploitation will again be rife.

The bank-controlled loans in China account for the increase in Chinese goods and textiles in this country and the consequent harm to our own textile workers. The same also accounts for the propaganda whereby sympathy was solicited for their war with Japan years before Pearl Harbor. In fact, if Japan did not want American and European interests controlling China, nor using her as a base to eventually control Japan herself, she probably would not have gone to war with China.

Japan could without war dominate the Orient just as the United States dominated the American continent. The countries who want America for Americans, Europe for Europeans did not logically want the Orient for Orientals. The strongholds of Singapore, Hong Kong, Canton, Shanghai, with army and naval forces sent by governments to protect the interests of private bankers and taken at their own risks, were reasons enough to cause Japan to fear the encroachment of foreign domination. Knowledge of international financial intrigue simplifies much.

Chapter VII

Big Berthas and the Big Four

"On the basis of clear documentary evidence scholars dissected the myth, propagated by those Powers, that Germany was wholly responsible in inaugurating the war (World War I).... The gleaming mirage that pictured the World War was purely or even mainly a war for democracy and civilization dissolved beyond recognition."

That is the scholarly, unbiased conclusion of those renowned historians, Charles A. and Mary R. Beard in their recent "Basic History of the United States." It is time to examine simple recorded history as an answer to those who have been selling a bill of goods.

"But what special reason was there for the United States to embark on a vast crusade for the purpose of saving democracy? For a hundred and twenty-five years our democratic republic had got along very well in a world full of emperors, sultans and despots. Why should we try to set up democratic states in Europe? The European peoples were capable of establishing democracies if they really wanted them. How Czarist Russia, an Allied nation afflicted with the most despotic government in the world, could be made safe for democracy was a question without an answer—at that time. But the democratization of Russia was not discussed: that part of the problem was simply ignored."

In all this muddled thinning there was a quixotic quality. Romantic expeditions to rescue the Holy Grail are thrilling when they cost little or nothing. They lose their charm when they involve the loss of billions of dollars and the lives of a great many young men. So far as making the world safe for democracy was concerned, the entire movement was nothing but eyewash and propaganda. On the part of the European powers the World War was a war of conquest."

That was written in "A New American History," by W. E. Woodward and well expresses the popular learned opinion of today. From "The Empire of 'The City'," by Knuth, we read:

"Since the Rothschild dynasty attained control of British finance 130 years ago, every major war has been fought to utter collapse of British opponents and unconditional surrender, and has left international finance omnipotent and unrestrained in organizing a new power-block to enforce the peace and to exploit the victory. Each of these successive power-blocks has failed in a brief length of time due to the desertion of an ally infuriated by

the boundless greed of the British bankers, and has led to a new war. and these wars have been of progressively greater scope and fury."

The last fifty years give grim evidence of Knuth's observation. In 1898 the Filipinos were allies of the United States in her war with Spain. Only a year later found the United States at war against her former friend, the Filipinos, and at peace with Spain. In 1904 American sympathies were with Japan against the aggressor, czarist Russia, which was decisively beaten. In 1914 Japan and Italy were beloved American allies. Later her ax-friends, Japan and Italy, became enemies at war with America and another ex-ally, Great Britain; and at peace with newly-found friends, the Reds. At times Americans love and hate the Chinese, Mexicans and Argentines by turns. Their friend Russia was having a terrible time beating another friend, Finland. Friend Russia was an ally of their enemy, Germany and divided friend Poland between them. America's present ally Russia soon went to war against her ex-friend, Germany, and formed a stronger friendship with her enemy Japan. America declared war on ax-friends Finland and Italy and saved our principal historic enemy, England, from ignominious defeat.

The artillery and other weapons which Greek insurgents on the Left used to fight the British were given them by the British. Bulgaria sided with the Axis, whereas the Serbs heroically resisted Hitler. But now that the Serbs have been liberated and the Bulgarians conquered by the Allies, the same Bulgarian troops who fought for Hitler are "policing" the Serbians who fought on our side. The man who represented the greatest threat to the government of General de Gaulle in France was Maurice Thorez, communist leader. In order to get back to France from Russia, where he was a refugee from justice as a war deserter, he had to be pardoned and was pardoned by de Gaulle! The same Americans who are most angry over British interference in the domestic affairs of Italy and Greece were most enthusiastic over Russian interference in the domestic affairs of Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Persia.

Referring to a more recent event, the Chicago Tribune writes editorially:

"History records few more sardonic and cynical reversals than the present spectacle in Java, where three months after a supposed war to the death between Japan and Great Britain, Japanese troops are now fighting under British command against the Indonesian nationalists. A British spokesman has paid the Jap[anese] the compliment that they are 'good troops,' and is pleased to say that they are 'very good' about taking Indonesians prisoners instead of shooting them out of hand. The civilized world, including Americans who remember the death march of Bataan, is apparently expected to be overcome by admiration.

The new found alliance between the surrendered Jap[anese] garrison in Java and its English protectors may seem strange in view of the hostilities but recently ended. The British hardly can feel any great attachment to the Jap[anese] when they recall the disastrous reverses at arms they sustained at Japanese hands in Hong Kong, Malaya, and Burma. Yet a dispassionate analysis might suggest sound grounds for the new entente.

A consideration which cannot be overlooked is that the Indonesians, in their fight at Surabaya against the British and their Indian mercenaries have put up a defense which has been much more stubborn and successful than was the British defense of Singapore against the Jap[anese]. The Indonesian rabble in arms has proved a match for the empire's trained and well equipped troops. The British, with a considerable respect born of recent experience in the field against the Japanese soldiery, have with some logic shunted their task to their former enemies, in the evident hope that the Jap[anese] will prove more successful."

American armed might, as well as that of the other great (God save the mark!) allies, was not directed by the principles of justice nor by the welfare of peoples cherishing the blessings of liberty and freedom. It was directed by the international caste of Untouchables who frequently start a nice war somewhere in order to increase the national debts of their slaves in order that the increased interest thereon would enhance their fortunes, or because it is profitable to overthrow a government it was formerly profitable to support, or to subdue a country either to sack its wealth or to keep an honest and efficient monetary system from showing the dishonesty and inefficiency of their own.

Shortly before World War I, H. G. Wells, English writer and historian, in his book entitled "Social Forces in England and America" wrote as follows:

"We in Great Britain are now intensely jealous of Germany. We are intensely jealous of Germany not only because the Germans outnumber us, and have a much larger and diversified country than ours, and lie in the very heart and body of Europe, but because in the last hundred years, while we have fed on platitudes and vanity, they have had the energy and humility to develop a splendid system of education, to toil at science and art and literature, to develop social organization, to master and better our methods of business and industry, and to clamber above us in the scale of civilization. This has humiliated and irritated us rather than chastened us."

Mr. Wells further informed readers that one must learn German *“if one would be abreast of scientific knowledge and philosophical thought, or see many good plays and understand the contemporary mind.”*

That was Mr. Wells’ solemn and convincing opinion shortly before the first World War. A little later, when the war had broken out, he turned his honest conviction down to the lying “propaganda for proper geese,” as the Duke of Bedford calls it, in order to make the world fight the war of financiers and fools. Said Wells then:

“That trampling, drilling foolery in the heart of Europe, that has arrested civilization for forty years, German imperialism and German militarism has struck the inevitable blow.”

When a person considers the cold facts of the cause of World War I, he fully recognizes the abominable infamy of such propaganda. To get Germany off its leading position into which it had moved by honest toil, as Wells stated, instead of subjugating and robbing the world, as England had done, not for years, but for centuries, the holocaust of war was started. To secure the participation of Russia in the conflict, Russia was promised unhindered passage through the Dardanelles—a promise completely ignored when the job was completed.

Russia, with the help of Serbia, concocted the murder of Sarajevo. When Austria’s righteous demand for an explanation failed, war against Serbia broke out. Russia came to her assistance, as was arranged. This in turn involved Germany as an ally of Austria in case of Russian attack, as was also intended. Siberian army corps, held ready for months, crossed the German border before the war was declared. France then declared war on Germany, and England joined her henchmen in a great conspiracy to get rid of a successful competitor.

The United States placed in the same situation as Germany or Austria could not have acted one bit differently than they did. Yet, in spite of this evident aggression or part of the Allies, the world was propagandized with the lie: *“Germany wants to rule the world”*. The world must come to realize that Germany had simply become a victim of the “evil genius of Europe”.

Pierre Van Passen in “Days of Our Years,” a worthy book on this phase of European troubles in spite of its other shortcomings, comes as near as anyone in summing up informed opinion when he writes:

“Those war lords (the Kaiser and Hindenburg) had been victims of circumstances as much as the humblest privates in the ranks. The war had not been started because the Kaiser decreed it. Germany had been maneuvered into a position where there was no other way out of war. The cause lay much deeper. There was something in the nature of the constituted order which produced wars as naturally as toadstools came to the surface after a spell of rain in the forest... The German people are not more barbarous than any other nation.

War is not the consequence of animalistic instincts in man, but a result of profound social antagonisms which pitch vested interests against natural forces. Not only the war, but the ruin and decay which come over every land after the war, are the outcome of the same fundamental maladjustment: The exploitation of a productive majority by a moneyed minority."

More proof that forces other than Germany caused World War I comes from Lord Lothian, first-ranking diplomat of the British Government. Lord Lothian said:

"Now the Versailles settlement was based on the theory of the whole responsibility of Germany for the Great War. I do not think anybody who has made a serious study of pre-war history, or even of the events which immediately preceded the war, can hold that view today. In my view Germany had no more responsibility for the war than anybody else, for two reasons; First of all because of her challenge to the British fleet—at one time she put down a program of building ultimately involving a fleet greater than the then British fleet; secondly because of her belief in and practice of what are called her politics by force, diplomacy by force."

On the other hand, nobody had ever yet suggested the Germany was responsible for the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, which precipitated the crisis. Further, what finally made the war inevitable, according to the strategic facts known to everyone at that time, was the mobilization of the Russian armies, which inevitably brought into play the Schlieffen Plan"

On April 1, 1917, John Haynes Holmes said in a sermon:

"If you tell me that this war is fought for the integrity of international law, I must ask you why it is directed only against Germany and not also against England.... If you say that it is fought in vindication of national honor, I must ask you why no harm has come to the honor of Holland and Scandinavia. . . . If you say that this war is a life and death struggle for the preservation of civilization against barbarism, I must ask you why we remained neutral when Belgium was raped, and were at last aroused to action, not by the cries of the stricken abroad, but by our own losses in men and money."

Testifying at the same executive session of the foreign relations committee at which he was asked about secret treaties, President Wilson declared that the German submarine attacks were not responsible for American entrance into the war, as is often heard. He was examined by Senator McCumber as follows:

McCumber: Do you think if Germany had committed no act of war or no act of injustice against our citizens that we would have gotten into this war?

Wilson: I do think so.

McCumber: You think we would have gotten in anyway?

Wilson: I do.

Intellectually, the establishment of belief in German war guilt was a difficult task. However, with the appeal being made to emotion rather than intellect fewer difficulties were presented. Primarily it called for omission of the consideration of certain actions by Serbia, France, and England. For instance, the responsibility of the Serbian government for the tragedy at Sarajevo was ignored or written down. Russian mobilization was discounted as soon as British censorship went into effect. French encouragement of Russian pugnacity was not revealed. The British failure to curb the belligerent attitudes of France and Russia was hidden behind the publicity given to Grey's attempts to hold back Austria-Hungary....

The attempt to prove Germany's guilt also called for the removal of the causes of the war with the Balkans to Berlin. This was done by placing emphasis on the events after Germany and France had declared war rather than on those preceding this step. . .

Perhaps the most persuasive arguments of the British on the origins of the war were based upon the contention that they entered the war to protect Belgium, i. e., in defense of Belgian of neutrality. It was made to appear convincing by ignoring the whole series of events between 1901 and 1914, and by omitting from the published documents certain vital correspondence.

"It was possible that England might come to the assistance of some small nation such as Belgium even if British interests were not involved. However, British participation in the war had been guaranteed by steps taken long before German troops crossed the Belgian frontier. Page admitted that the British would have been found fighting with France even if France had violated Belgium. (From Intimate Papers, II, 319)"

This is the authoritative conclusion of H. C. Peterson in his scholarly book, "Propaganda for War". It was the international bankers which were back of the gigantic propaganda drive. Thus on November 24, 1916, Morgan cabled Paris:

"We want you to know that we are engaged in steady educational work to prepare the way for another French loan".

A Mr. Davison, one of the Morgan partners, was especially interested in keeping the Federal Reserve and the government from interfering with their work. He kept in constant touch with members of the board and occasionally even called upon the President. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer was *"greatly impressed with the skill and usefulness of . . . (Davison's) propaganda."*

Paul Warburg, father of the Federal Reserve Bank recorded:

"There has been going on quite an active press campaign, the object of which was to show that unless we granted foreign credits quite freely, the country ran the risk of being choked with gold with the attendant consequence of inflation of prices and credits."

After reporting to the Cabinet that the financial press in America was *"preparing the way for fresh loans to the allies"* Sir Gilber Parker added the interesting information that the Financial and Commercial Chronicle has supported all the loan operations of the allies.

. . . The paper has . . . special affiliations with Standard Oil interests.

The secret document cabled by American Ambassador Page in London to the State Department in March, 1917, proved, as will be seen, that American finance must keep the other strongholds of the Goliath of greed in England and France from collapsing. It looked black for this inkpot kingdom when the job got too big for such private agencies as Morgan, Kuhn-Loeb, Rothschild and Companies. So Uncle Sam was to be dragged in and save their plight lest it be said that the flesh and blood of millions are worth more than the paper and gold of the few!

"As a banker and creditor, the United States would have a place at the peace conference table, and be in a much better position to resist any proposed repudiation of debts, for it might as well be remembered that we will be forced to take up the cudgels for any of our citizens owning bonds that might be repudiated."

Those are the words of the President of the Bank Board of the United States, Mr. E. P. C. Harding, speaking just previous to American entrance into World War I. The American people in general might not have known why they got into that bloody mess, that cesspool of suffering, misery and futility; but the bankers did. It was to make good the bonds of this hydra of hypocrisy bought at their own risk and invested in an Allied victory. When it became evident they were betting on the wrong horse, the avalanche of blood, tears, sweat, poverty and death were unleashed upon innocent victims to make good the sport of high finance.

The world should realize that international finance so controlled the fate of men and their governments that these denizens of death in the inaccessible heights of their gilded sanctuaries deluged chaos upon the earth and dragged America into the bloody, slimy pit

in order that they might have a strong support upon which to stand head and shoulders above the common fate. Long ago Americans began to suspect that their government did not go to war because it was influenced by Germany's violation of Belgian neutrality or by Germany's sinking of a couple of ships violating the German right to impose contraband, or by her efforts to induce Mexico to make war on them, or by the danger that a German victory would make this country next on the German list of invasions.

Before the Nye Investigating Committee J. P. Morgan and his partners admitted doing everything "lawfully" possible to help England and France win the war; that defeat of England and France would mean great losses to them personally; that they made \$30-million on shipments alone; that they were the fiscal agent for Great Britain in this country and were making huge purchases of supplies, guns, and munitions for its allied client. The investigation brought out much. There was much more it did not bring out, not because of any fault on part of the investigators, but because Morgan messengers hot-footed it to Roosevelt with the information that unless these hearings were stopped, they would be forced to reveal facts embarrassing to the administration-banker alliance. Funds for the continuance of these vital procedures were refused appropriation. Patriotic organizations offered money for their continuation but it could not be accepted.

Every time the committee wanted legitimate papers from the files of the notorious war mongers they were refused. Constant wrangling did no good. Only threat of prosecution would bring the papers into the open where their smell so violently assaulted the nostrils of peace-loving and patriotic citizens. Certain quarters attempted to becloud the issue by saying these investigators should respect private files. But when these private individuals were reasonably indicted as operating public welfare against its better interest, when papers of public importance should logically be open to public inspection, as long as the good of a few is subject to the common good of the many, the position of these critics is as ludicrous as their purpose. Epithets of "coward," or "traitor ghoul dipping into the graveyard of history," were flung at Chairman Nye by his fellow Senators, Glass of Virginia and Connally of Texas, who refusing to admit facts they could not explode, got out their buckets and brushes and began smearing.

The big bankers knew that where the government's treasure (money) was there its heart would also be. That was in the war. A war to make the world safe for Democracy? A war to end wars? Those were actually the ideals of some of the noble representatives outside the influence of the banks. But when they arrived to take part in the treaty negotiations they were continually embarrassed to discover the existence of secret treaties which prevented the American delegation from furthering the kind of peace it had been talking about, just as Roosevelt's secret agreements hampered the work of American delegates after the late war.

Americans had better realize that before making the world safe for Democracy, they had better first make Democracy safe for the world by separating it from the dictatorship of high finance. Americans must also realize that before engaging in another war to end wars, they had better first try a just peace to end wars.

The conduct of American affairs had followed the traditional Washingtonian policy of “no foreign entanglements” until her International masters compelled her to conduct her affairs on an international basis even though it meant great sacrifices on which none but the International masters would profit. On the very day the United States entered World War I the government took over the Morgan burden of \$400 million loaned to the British Government and placed that burden on the backs of American taxpayers who are still bending under that burden, paying interest and principle on that same amount into the treasury, not of the government, but of the privileged money men. Such debts have since increased many times over, and have each time increased the taxpayers burden in the same proportion.

Interlocking directorates and financial investments enable bankers to influence war mongering groups, control profitable munitions manufactures, and extend their tentacles into the money bags of commerce. In 1915 Germany was becoming England’s rival in the European field of commerce which indicated an increase in German prosperity and a menace to the rule of Capitalistic countries. This would have to be stopped. Following the same pattern some twenty-five years later it is significant that the first saber-rattling speech given by Franklin D. Roosevelt in the preliminary skirmish of World War II, was delivered at Chautauqua, New York, shortly following the release of figures showing the German exports had surpassed those of England for the first time since World War I.

If international finance had cared to give up the choicest profits of war, the Allies could have brought the German military machine to its knees before the end of 1915! But the greedy monster is influenced by neither patriotism, honor, nor shame. Impervious to any noble aspiration and scornful of everlasting disgrace, it sought only dollars. It knew that if things got too hot on the battle fields, its American branch would come to its rescue. That is just what was done—and at a nice profit, too. They loved war because they knew that killing their fellowman was the most profitable business in the world.

The only reason World War I did not break out in 1908 instead of 1914 is because the British bankers did not seem to be any too sure of American participation in their behalf, since the Federal Reserve System had not as yet been set up in the United States. Without Uncle Sam as trigger man it would have been plain suicide for John Bull to have picked a fight with the Kaiser. Note the dates and the principal events:

1908—German trade expansion was depriving Britain of her European and American markets.
1910—The British feverishly pressed America for a central bank of issue as an American branch of international finance controlled from London.

1913–The Federal Reserve Act was finally established.

1914–World War I began.

Merely a set of coincidences? Let's see. By 1890 the English bankers were alarmed over the loss of two-thirds of the English European markets at the hands of German expansion. The bankers' study into the causes were equally frightful. German industry was foremost in the manufacture of Precision Tools, Chemicals, and Dyes—the three articles which are the foundation of modern industry. But worse yet, the English bankers found that German trade with Europe and the United States was conducted without the need of bankers financing.

The decrepit system of English finance did not and never will allow England and her vessels to compete with soundly-financed systems by becoming more powerful themselves. They meet competition, not by becoming more prosperous but by making their competitors less prosperous. This ultimately leads to war if these other nations will not accept the “benevolent” aid of a few billion dollars, or some other form of subjugation to British finance. Germany obstinately continued to prosper on a system of Trade and Barter with the surplus products of German factories and laboratories, which were in great demand, and were exchanged for the surplus food and raw materials of other nations.

Particularly distressing to the English bankers was the discovery that Germany was establishing a vast lay-out of plants and laboratories for the manufacture of Precision Tools, Chemicals and Dyes in the United States. Moreover, heavy German investments in American factories and railroads were proceeding to erect an industrial system that would deprive English utilities, dominated and owned by English banks, of her American markets as they were being deprived of European markets.

England could not hope to match the intelligence, efficiency and prosperity of Germany's modern and resourceful Industrial Empire. She would have to meet this competition by tearing down the advancements of modern science and the progress of human civilization. It is no wonder that Woodrow Wilson later admitted in a moment of frankness: *“We fought a commercial war.”*

This German-American setup frustrated the International Bankers' plan to dominate the world by shifting gold from one nation to the other. One of two things had to disappear, either the World Plan of International Banker or the Industrial power of Germany. To assure the success of the former, the banks began searching for allies. Thus in 1904 a secret treaty for stealing Morocco and giving it to France was signed by England and France. The banks hoped German resistance to this theft would offer an excuse for hostilities. Germany had reasons to resist because for twenty years previously most of the hydro-electric, railroad and sanitary equipment of Morocco had come from Germany and had been paid for with the surplus products of Morocco—another example of prosperity without borrowed money from the banks. Germany did resist this plot.

Friction dragged on through the following year and in 1906 the International Bankers proposed arbitration with Teddy Roosevelt as arbitrator. Since he was secretly on their side, this move would assure a report in the favor of high finance as well as embroil America on their side. The almost faultless booklet, "Forty Years of Roosevelt" by T. W. Hughes, sums up the situation in 1908 as follows:

"By secret treaties with Russia, Rumania, Greece, France and Belgium, England had completely encircled Germany with a wall of steel, and by the nearly secret Reciprocal Trade Treaties of Theodore (Roosevelt), England had cut off most of the food and raw materials upon which Germany must depend in time of war."

In "The Coming War" by Francis Delaisi, Member of the French Chamber of Deputies, written in 1911, translated and published in Boston in 1915, the author told how Germany had been an agricultural country up to the time of Bismarck, but the land was so poor that 300,000 Germans had to emigrate every year. When Bismarck came to power his chief desire was to make Germany an industrial nation like England.

Thus factories began to spring up in Germany. Soon the Germans were giving England real competition. Delaisi stated that England would bring war on Germany to get rid of the competitor and England could easily do this by blockading German ports, for Germany had to import her raw material, manufacture finished products and then export them.

Delaisi wrote there was only one difficulty, and that was that there were two side doors to Germany, through Holland and Belgium, but Belgium was a neutral country, whose neutrality had been guaranteed by certain countries, and when England blockaded Antwerp, the Germans would march into Belgium just as every nation would react under such circumstances. There would be war on the continent, and Germany would want to borrow French money. Delaisi said that the French should say to the English: "You cannot have our men," and to the Germans: "You cannot have our money." He said that was what the French people would say if they were consulted, but the financial oligarchy which rules "democratic" French will sell the lives of hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen for some foreign concessions. And when World War I came it did just that.

President Wilson, while getting U.S.A. into World War I against his promise to keep out, under the pretext of a holy crusade for Democracy, truly spoke words of disillusion when he admitted after the war that it was made because of commercial rivalry.

The American Government had entered into Reciprocal Trade Treaties with every country in Europe except Germany. The result was that all the surplus products of these European nations could be bought by the United States would be paid for principally with gold. The citadel of corruption (International Banks) did not trust open conflict because of

a new policy by which the United States must not only win the war for them but finance it as well. For safety this required the establishment of a central bank of issue in the United States under the domination of English finance.

The International Bankers tried to run Theodore Roosevelt for a third term just as they did the second Roosevelt who was as much a champion of high finance as was Theodore. Both were totally unfit to hold office in any constitutional government. After the first Roosevelt refused to run for a third term, he was asked to select as a successor a man "who would listen to reason." William Howard Taft was the man, but instead of adhering to the policies of Roosevelt and the ruinous ravages of his bosses, Taft pursued the course of the founding Fathers of America and the Constitution. This turn of events so shocked Teddy that he and his London fellow conspirators cut short their famous hunting trip into Africa and hurried back to London.

Taft had to be replaced. The big bankers and their agent for this purpose, Colonel House, knew William J. Bryan and Champ Clark were the two men the American people favored for Taft's successor. But these men could not be controlled—would not "listen to reason." So House spent a week with a comparatively unknown, Woodrow Wilson, at Sea Girt, New Jersey, and found him "safe." Thereafter House and the bankers got busy buying bosses and delegates. The nomination of their candidate, Wilson, was a foregone conclusion before that national disgrace, the farcial, cheaply-staged side show where candidates are bought and principles sold, and known as the National Convention, was ever held.

Their master stroke of strategy was in getting enough people to vote for him after he had been selected. This proved to be so difficult that they had to invent a scheme to keep them from voting for his opponent Taft. So they ran Teddy on a third party known as the Progressive Party.

Says T. W. Hughes in the above mentioned booklet:

"There have been some rotten campaigns in Denmark, New York and Chicago (1940) but nothing before or since has equaled the campaign of 1912, with its unadulterated putridity and its criminal betrayal of the hopes and interests of the American people. For we know now and many of us knew then, that the Big Bankers hadn't the slightest hope that Teddy would be elected for a third term and that the only reason he had been sent into the campaign was to split the Republican vote, and thus defeat Mr. Taft who would not play the Banker's game, while electing Mr. Wilson who would play that game. And play it he did, whether he ever fully realized it or not.

It was the Republican Party which made him (Roosevelt) Governor of New York, and the Republican Party which made him President of the United

States; therefore when in the campaign of 1912 his desertion of his Party made possible the election of Wilson and the War and tragedy that followed; it was a circumstance that can neither be lightly dismissed nor ever forgotten."

Thus the completion of the final detail of getting the United States to finance as well as fight their war was the project immediately after the election of Wilson. By December of 1913 this had been assured when President Wilson signed the Federal Reserve Act. Quoting Hughes again:

"In April, 1917 the International Bankers could rub their hands in glee and say, 'We planned it that way.' And so today, from our too much disinterested vantage-point, we can look back over that period of seventeen years from 1900 when Theodore was elected Vice-President to 1917 when Woodrow Wilson took us into War, and see as in some vast panorama an unbroken series of wars and revolutions in which thrones toppled into dust, empires followed suit, and Kings, Emperors, Czars and Sultans joined the ranks of the forgotten men, and over which and through which the Four Horsemen, War, Pestilence, Famine and Death rode like the Valkyries of some demoniac Wagner.

Thus it happened that from the days of Woodrow Wilson until the coming of the second Roosevelt, our people increasingly declared that 'never again would we leave our own to stand on foreign ground,' and that never again' would American wealth and manhood be used to save British Imperialism, in the name of a false Democracy. But again they were doomed to disappointment for the wars and depressions that had brought to the International Bankers not merely an increase of wealth and power, but more important still the certainty that another seventeen or twenty years would bring them the completion of their World Plan for World Domination."

For the first few years in office the high-principled, inexperienced Wilson pursued the traditional American policy of Washington and Jefferson. The following words of Washington could well have been those of Wilson:

"Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the coils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor or caprice?"

Jefferson's philosophy also coincided with the slogan of Jefferson, namely, *"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."*

Wilson was a sincere intellectual and while free to act as such, did so. In his first Lusitania note in 1915, he said:

"The example of America must be a special example. The example of America must be the example of peace, not merely because it will not fight, but of peace because peace is the leading and elevating influence of the world and strife is not. There is such a thing as a man being too proud to fight."

The next year was a campaign year, and Wilson naturally aspired to be re-nominated and elected for a second term. He overlooked no opportunity to remind the people that he had "kept us out of war," and every speech he made carried the implied promise that he would not only continue to keep us out of war but that he stood squarely, and unyieldingly for the foreign policy laid down by Washington, Jefferson and Monroe. The people believed and applauded him when he declared that he would keep the United States out of the European conflict. Over and over he insisted that America heed the wise counsel of Washington, and observe the Monroe Doctrine.

In Chicago on the 31st of January, 1916, President Wilson said:

"I believe that we can serve the nations at war better by remaining at peace and holding off from this contest than we could possibly serve them in any other way. Your interest, your sympathy, your affection may be engaged on one side or the other, but it is your duty to stand off and not let this nation be drawn into the war."

In a speech at Des Moines on February 1, 1916, he said:

"There are actually men in America who are preaching war, who are preaching the duty of the United States to do what it never would before seek entanglements in the controversies which have arisen on the other side of the water—abandon its habitual and traditional policy and deliberately engage in the conflict which is now engulfing the rest of the world. I do not know what the standard of citizenship of these gentlemen may be. I only know that I for one cannot subscribe to those standards."

A little knowledge of the conspiracy of International finance would have identified those "men in America who are preaching war" and given the reasons why America must "abandon its habitual and traditional policy and deliberately engage in the conflict now engulfing the rest of the world." In his speech of September 2, 1916, accepting the renomination he said:

"We have been neutral not only because it was the fixed and traditional policy of the United States to stand aloof from the politics of Europe . . . but because it was manifestly our duty to prevent, if it were possible, the extension of the fires of hate and desolation kindled by that terrible conflict."

But, unfortunately, it was the International Bankers who were running the show, not Wilson. Events were shaping up in such a fashion that the course of American ideals would soon be reversed with all the grace and elegance of a figure skater. In August, 1914, the French made a request to J. P. Morgan and Co. for a loan of at least, a hundred million dollars. Morgan replied that such a transaction was impossible at that time because of the objections of the United States government. In his cable he expressed belief that after a little while it might be a very possible and excellent thing to do. France was not satisfied with this refusal and again requested the loan just five days later. The Paris firm of Morgan, Harjes and Co. cabled repeated demands.

When these frantic calls leaked out, Morgan cabled his Paris firm in part as follows:

"We have issued statement today stating French Government have not applied to us for loan but that private interests have asked if we could consider making a loan in case French Government would desire."

At this time, William J. Bryan as Secretary of State sent an important letter to Wilson in connection with the attempts to float loans. He remarked:

"Money is the worst of all contrabands because it commands everything else.... If we approved of such loans . . . our citizens would be divided into groups, each group loaning money to the country which it favored and this money could not be furnished without expressions of sympathy. These expressions are disturbing enough when they do not rest upon pecuniary interests – they would be still more disturbing if each group was peculiarly interested in the success of the nation to whom its members had loaned money. The powerful financial interests which would be connected with these loans would be tempted to use their influence through the newspapers to support the interests of the government to which they had loaned."

H. Davison of J. P. Morgan and Company, together with such other bankers as R. L. Farnham and Willard Straight, kept a steady pressure on the American State Department to overthrow the State Department's restrictions on loans. They finally got the "Blood soaked boom" started by making a technical distinction between loans and credit—a distinction which J. P. Morgan admitted did not exist. But it served the propagandists with good copy to feed the public. It also allowed the State Department to say: *"We didn't give in. We don't allow loans just credit."* The decision on the part of Lansing and Wilson to change the loan policy in this way, and at the same time evade responsibility for the change, does not reflect credit upon the statesmanship of either of them, but does, perhaps, properly credit the effects of bankers' pressure.

This was an appropriate time for negotiations between J. P. Morgan and Company and the British government, with the object in mind of designating the Morgan firm as the controlling purchasing agent for the British government. These negotiations were completed January 15, 1915, and Edward R. Stettinius (later one of Roosevelt's Secretaries of State and head of the American delegation to the United Nations Organization) was placed in direct charge of buying for the British. Somewhat later in the year the Morgan firm also became the purchasing agent for the French government.

Hon. H. A. Michaelson, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, May 26, 1921, said:

"In March, 1915, the J. P. Morgan Interests, steel, shipbuilding, powder and their subsidiary organizations got together twelve men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and a sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

These twelve men selected 179 newspapers, they found it was only necessary to purchase the control of twenty-five of the greatest papers. The policy, national and international, of these papers was bought and paid for so much a month; this contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns being filled with all sorts of arguments and misrepresentations about the United States Army, Navy, the probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes, suppression of everything in opposition to the interests served . . . stuff carried in daily press to commercialize public sentiment, sand-bag the National Congress into making wasteful appropriations."

M. Gabriel Hanoteaux, Minister of Foreign Affairs for France, stated:

"France was ready to make peace the latter part of 1914, but was persuaded not to by three Americans, Robert Bacon of the Financial House of J. P. Morgan and Co.; Myron T. Herrick, and Wm. G. Sharp, pledging to French officials that if France would continue in the war these three men would organize a propaganda to put the United States into the war on the side of the Allies."

It has been said that as early as the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point.

Morgan's friend, Strong, and Delano, both of the Federal Reserve Board called upon Colonel House. As a result of this meeting, House wrote to President Wilson:

"Delano and Governor Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank were here yesterday to see me concerning the serious condition that confronts us in regard to foreign exchange. They believe that unless the Federal Reserve System broadens its basis of credits that another month or two will bring about a crisis and almost a complete breakdown of our foreign trade . . ."

The complete take-over by the Internationalists was first indicated as a certainty when Secretary Lansing wrote Wilson:

"My Dear Mr. President:

Doubtless Secretary McAdoo has discussed with you the necessity of floating Government loans for the belligerent nations, which are purchasing such great quantities of goods in this country, in order to avoid a serious financial situation which will not only affect them but this country as well....

If the European countries cannot find means to pay for the excess of goods sold to them over those purchased from them they will have to stop buying and our present export trade will shrink proportionately. The result would be restriction of outputs, industrial depression, idle capital and idle labor, numerous failures, financial demoralization, and general unrest and suffering among the laboring classes....

I believe that Secretary McAdoo is convinced, and I agree with him, that there is only one means of avoiding this situation, which would so seriously affect economic conditions in this country, and that is the floatation of large bond issues by the belligerent governments.

The difficulty is--and this is what Secretary Mc-Adoo came to see me about--that the Government early in the war announced that it considered 'war loans' to be contrary to the 'true spirit of neutrality.'

The Practical reasons for the policy at the time we adopted it were sound, but basing it on the ground that loans are "inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality" is now a source of embarrassment....

Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the "true spirit of neutrality" ...Stand in the way of our national interests which seem to be seriously threatened?

Lansing".

This was the setting against which Wilson began to proclaim a doctrine which later became his favorite theme, the “self-determination” of small nations. He now foreshadowed the spirit which dominated the peace conferences, and finally revealed his plan for a League of Nations. Compare his statements of the American policy of peace before the buzzards of Britain stealthily made him over and the statements of the international policy of greed and war which he uttered after the make-over became as apparent as it was real.

In his message to Congress, April 2, 1917, Wilson said:

“Our object—is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against the selfish and autocratic power and set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and action as henceforth will insure the observance of these principles.

“The right,” he declared in his concluding paragraphs, is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her she can do no other.”

Two weeks later the President, in a message to the American people commenting on “the entrance of our beloved country into the grim and terrible war for democracy and human rights,” said:

“There is not a single selfish element, so far as I can see, in the cause we are fighting for.”

In December of the same year Wilson said in his Address to Congress:

“It is because it is for us a war of high, disinterested purpose, in which all the free people of the world are banded together for the vindication of right, a war for the preservation of our nation and of all that it has held dear of principle and of purpose, that we feel ourselves doubly constrained to propose for its outcome only that which is righteous and of irreproachable intention, for our foes as well as for our friends.

The cause being just and holy, the settlement must be of like motive and quality. For this we can fight, but for nothing less noble or less worthy of our traditions. For this cause we entered the war, and for this cause we will battle until the last gun is fired."

Those who sold their World War I President such a bill of goods were worthy predecessors for the one-world, do-gooder, communistic, starry-eyed, crack-pot, putty-brained left wing pressure groups who sold the World War II President on the principle of fighting for Christianity, civilization and democracy to be followed up with a United Nations Organization and a World Bank.

The most important single document directly affecting Wilson's declaration of war was sent by the American ambassador to Britain, Walter Haines Page, himself an international banker, and deserves special attention.

Below is printed in full the document secretly sent by Ambassador Page to the Department of State on March 5, 1917 After having read it, learn this lesson: America went to war some twenty years ago to save the hide of the international bankers, politely referred to as the financial structure of Europe.

Ambassador in Great Britain to the Secretary of State (Cablegram)

London, March 5, 1917, 1 p.m. (Received March 6, 3:20 a.m.)

5794. M5644, February 9, 10 a.m.

"The financial inquiries made here reveal an international condition most alarming to the American financial and industrial outlook. England is obliged to finance her allies as well as to meet her own war expenses. She has as yet been able to do these tasks out of her own resources. But in addition to these tasks she cannot continue her present large purchases in the United States without shipments of gold to pay for them and she cannot maintain large shipments of gold for two reasons: first, both England and France must retain most of the gold they have to keep their paper money at par; and second, the submarine has made the shipping of gold too hazardous, even if they had it to ship.

The almost immediate danger, therefore, is that Franco-American and Anglo American exchange will be so disturbed that orders by all the Allied Governments will be reduced to the lowest minimum and there will be almost a cessation of transatlantic trade. This will, of course, cause a panic in the United States. The world will be divided into two hemispheres, one of which has gold and commodities and the other, which needs these commodi-

ties, will have no money to pay for them. The financial and commercial result will be almost as bad for one as for the other. This condition may soon come suddenly unless action is quickly taken to prevent it. France and England must have a large enough credit in the United States to prevent the collapse of world trade and of the whole European finance.

If we should go to war with Germany the greatest help we could give the Allies would be such a credit. In that case our Government could, if it would, make a large investment in a Franco-British loan or might guarantee such a loan. All the money would be kept in our own country, trade would be continued and enlarged till the war ends, and after the war. Europe would continue to buy food and would buy from us also an enormous supply of things to re-equip her peace industries. We should thus reap the profit of an uninterrupted, perhaps an enlarging, trade over a number of years and we should hold their securities in payment.

But if we hold most of the money and Europe cannot pay for re-equipment there may be a world-wide panic for an indefinite period.

Unless we go to war with Germany our government of course cannot make such a direct grant of credit, but is there no way in which our Government might indirectly, immediately, help the establishment in the United States of a large Franco British credit without a violation of armed neutrality? I am not sufficiently acquainted with our own reserve bank law to form an opinion, but if these banks were able to establish such a credit, they would avert this danger. It is a danger for us more real and imminent, I think, than the public on either side the ocean realizes. If it be not averted before its symptoms become apparent, it will then be too late to avert it.

I think that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan Financial agency for the British and French Governments. The need is becoming too great and urgent for any private agency to meet, for every such agency has to encounter jealousies of rivals and of sections.

Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present prominent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted. The submarine has added the last item to the danger of a financial world crash. During a period of uncertainty about our being drawn into the war, no more considerable credit can be privately placed in the United States and a collapse may come in the meantime."

It was only a matter of hours after the receipt of this cablegram until Wilson had prepared his Declaration of War speech, thereby indicating that the war was not fought for even the most boasted of humanitarian reasons. Wilson further proved this when he confessed in St. Louis shortly before his death:

"Is there a man or woman, nay, is there a child who does not know that the seeds of war are sown in hot commercial rivalry?"

"The real reason why some nations went to war against Germany was because they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them."

That message of Page's does not tell the whole story of war plotting, intrigue and propaganda but does stress the why of American participation in the conflict. Some sidelights on Page are interesting because he proved to be a prototype of the present breed of American "statesmen" and "diplomats" who are more British than American.

Page was from the outset a British apologist and had, as he explained, no respect for international law: *"International law is no strict code and it's all shot to pieces anyhow."* The latter part of his statement is interesting, for England had done a great deal of the shooting. Orders in Council had completely set aside every safeguard of the neutral, particularly the law governing contraband blockade and continuous voyage, a fact which the law officers of the State Department sought in vain to impress on Mr. Page. He argued, as Englishmen argued, that since the Allies were fighting for the right, they were justified in whatever they did. When right is the object-and "we" are always "right"-law is of no importance and may be ignored. Thus Page helped to introduce the Klu Klux spirit into international relations. He was, Americans are assured, a great American, and perhaps this fact proves it. The violators of the law have the right to define what is right and what is wrong contradicts, he is resorting to propaganda.

Typical of the nauseating namby-pamby naivete of the present UN-One World mental narcosis concerning British policy was his swallowed propaganda regarding German colonies. As late as the Spring of 1917 he wrote:

"Mr. Balfour told me yesterday his personal conviction about the German colonies. His firm opinion is that they ought not to be returned to the Germans, first for the sake of humanity. The natives-the Africans especially-have been so barbarously treated and so immorally that it would be inhuman to permit the Germans to rule and degrade them further. But Heaven forbid that we should still further enlarge the British Empire. As a practical matter I do not care to do that."

The world now knows as Bryan, Clark and others knew at the time, that this statement was a thinly disguised falsehood.

Henry Ford sent a peace ship to Europe to stop World War I. When he returned from Christiana, Ford confided that he knew his trip would fail before he had left sight of the American shores. Asked how he knew the trip was doomed to failure he explained:

"On the way down the harbor I talked with two men who have studied war for years. They showed me that wars are matters of business, of profitism, of percentages; that, no matter what countries are at war, or who wins or loses the International Bankers make huge profits. They told me that, if I hoped to end war, I would have to deal with the International Banking Ring."

With the American Federal Reserve Banking System patterned after the designs of its real founders in London, England, where the international bankers still keep their headquarters, it is not surprising that these curious verities of co-operation should exist. It is no mere coincidence, therefore, that America's foreign policy should be what these English headquarters want it to be. That explains why the American State Department has such spineless characteristics which make it in effect an American branch of the British Foreign Office. It is useless to say politicians and their political parties make foreign policy when it is the monetary manipulators who make politicians and their parties. Politicians and their actions are themselves effects, not causes. Nor is it a mere coincidence that every American ambassador to England since the establishment of the Federal Reserve System has been an international banker. The list is as follows: Walter Hines Page, John W. Davis, George Harvey, Frank B. Kellogg, Alanson B. Houghton, Charles G. Dawes, Andrew W. Mellon, Robert Worth ingham, Joseph P. Kennedy, John G. Winant, W. Averell Harriman.

The merchandisers of murder profited not only on interest from greatly increased national debts, but also from war supplies manufactured by utility companies they controlled. They even sold to the enemy at enormous profits. They engaged in these traitorous deals even though they knew full well their munitions would kill their own flesh and blood. Thus throughout the first three years of World War I Germany received all-important cotton, necessary in the manufacture of explosives, from countries which England could easily have blockaded.

The Krupp works of Essen, Germany, sent armaments to France and received payment in gold. France also gave Germany the assurance that the blast furnaces taken by German arms early in the conflict would not be bombarded. On the other hand, American dough-boys were ordered not to fire on certain German-held munitions factories which were producing instruments with which to kill them, because *"they are owned by British interests"*. During the war the Briey Basin was considered as holy and inviolable grounds by

the Internationalists; so much so that when an American officer wanted to bomb the arsenal out of existence he was forbidden to do so because, *"if we shell Briey the Germans will, in reprisal, shell Dombasle."* Dombasle was an Allied arsenal.

French destroyers captured ships loaded with nickel bound for Germany and were brought as prizes of war to French ports; but they were ordered released by French officials and eventually reached the German port of Bremen safely. In 1915 French officers were ordered to conduct their campaigns in such a way as to prolong the war because the profits derived from it had to continue at all costs. If the ordinary soldier gave the enemy as much as a gun he would be promptly court marshalled, but if the money merchandisers of murder sell millions of weapons to the enemy they are honored and praised in every conceivable way.

In return for magnetos for airplane engines, shipped by Germany, France gave bauxite, an indispensable ingredient in the manufacture of aluminum for Zeppelins. Barbed wire strung out by the British at Ypres and on the Somme river, which became a deathtrap for much of the Prussian Guard, was manufactured by the Drahtwerke of Opel and Company and found its way through Holland to England. Australia shipped fat to Germany by way of Norway and Denmark. British ships carried copra from the Straits settlements, tea from Ceylon, coke and coal from Wales, as well as tar and glycerin for high explosives—all to Germany.

In spite of all this British traffic for the cause of Germany, the British government had the highhanded, unwarranted audacity to black-list fifty American firms *"suspected of selling goods to the enemy."*

In 1920 the author of *"Union Now,"* Clarence K. Streit, wrote a pamphlet entitled, *"Where Iron Is, There Is the Fatherland."* It related much of the racketeering in munitions during the World War. On page twelve he says:

"In each of the European countries the mineral interests were tending at a rapid rate, as in the United States, toward combination, centralization and internationalization. Above them all was the famous international banking family of the Rothschilds, ... barons of Germany, England, France and Austria by business. And in the international Rothschild group when the war began, 210 shares were held by the Krupps (of Germany)...."

The wholesale slaughter of men, it cannot be denied, means good business to those who furnish the instruments of death. When war does not exist, these interests seek to cause it. That was shown by Liebknecht in 1913 when he exposed before the German Reichstag the policy of the Krupps, which was to subsidize French newspapers at Paris to attack Germany and then use these editorial attacks to convince the Reichstag that Germany for fear of France must increase her armament."

Fortune magazine published a most illuminating booklet on why wars are fought and prolonged in this highly civilized world. The editors of this booklet, "Arms and the Men," proved beyond doubt that the international munitions makers, owned and directed by the international bankers, regardless of nationalities, worked for more, bigger and longer wars. The method used was as simple as it was profitable: If the enemy is running out of essentials with which to destroy their own armies, sell him what he needs from their own supplies. Nonsensical national loyalties must not hamper such glorious carnage. The source mentioned above is very specific even to detailing the amounts of materials graciously exchanged between the warring nations, and likewise lists the exact dates of these transfers. It also furnished the authoritative sources of its information.

In World War II there is mounting evidence of the same policy. Copies of the German Heinkel planes were used in Russia. British Rolls-Royce engines were powering German planes all the while English statesmen were speculating on what the German air fleet would do to London. While Mussolini thundered invectives against Communism and Soviet Russia, his Italian workmen were paid for constructing a cruiser for Red Russia at the port of Livorno. America exported tons of manufactured armaments and raw materials to Japan which were certain to be used in the slaughter of American sons.

To be specific about some of the ways of America's international do-gooders, here are some interesting even if disgusting figures taken from page 405 of the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1945. When Japan attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor here is where her war materials came from:

Trucks, autos and parts, 91 percent given her by the United States of America. Copper, 93 percent given her by the United States of America. All oil, 60 percent given her by the United States. Pig iron, 41 percent given her by the United States. Scrap iron, 60 percent given her by the United States. Machinery and engines, 48 percent given her by the United States. High octane gasoline, 100 percent given her by the United States of America.

It can be seen from these statistics that an average of 75 percent of Japan's materials of war came from the United States. Without them the Japanese could never have started the war and would never dreamed of attacking at Pearl Harbor. These same vested interests responsible for this grant of supplies did not change their ways one iota even when American boys had American scrap iron shot into their flesh by the Japanese.

The International Bankers are the only people in the world who "granted" or could "grant" the funds with which to conduct a war. It was to their advantage to help and profit from both sides.

Before the fall of France, Germany sold her thousands of carloads of coke every week and received in return thousands of tons of iron ore for the manufacture of munitions. The Italian rayon trust was controlled by British money, and a director of the Bank of England

is also a director of this corporation. The Vickers Company of England owned large blocks of stocks in extensive Italian metal works. Douglas Vickers, two "Sirs," and a Chancellor of the Exchequer were all directors of a famous Italian electrical manufacturer. Railroad and power magnets in Germany functioned with English profiteering finance.

Upon the advice of Montague Norman, then head of the Bank of England, directors of large utilities began in 1934 to help Hitler. Their first move was to sponsor Hitler's secret rearmament just about to begin in defiance of the known terms of Versailles. Using their controlling interests in both Vickers and Imperial Chemical Industries, they instructed these large armament concerns to assist the German program by every means at their disposal.

Representative Daniel A. Reed of New York had an article, "Inside the Four-Power Pact," by Ladislav Farrago in Ken Magazine, inserted in the Congressional Record. This article continues the story as follows:

Both Vickers and I.C.I. were quite willing to cooperate, especially since this now official policy of London's financiers was in line with their own anti-Russian plans. Long before Montague Norman decided to use Hitler, Vickers had created a ring of armament factories in all countries which seemed Russia's potential enemies. They controlled the Societe Polonaise de Materielle de Guerre in Poland, the famous Mitsui Japanese Steel Works in Japan, the Vickers Terni and the Armstrong Pozznoli in Italy, and were working in close contact with the Krupps and other large armament factories in Germany.

The Bank's pro-German policy even made the Royal Navy come across. The British Admiralty and the German naval command were pledged to work in the closest possible co-operation: Secret clauses provided for an exchange of naval intelligence, and diverse information and details of inventions concerning naval construction. The British commission suggested that Germany discard her metric system on naval units and adopt the English linear system in order to enable English armament manufacturers to supply ammunition promptly should the German navy become engaged in hostilities. Germany placed at the disposal of the British admiralty an invention by the staff of the Berlin Technical College for use in submarine construction.

The London war office was forced to take its proper place in the pro-German policy. The war office agreed to a Berlin suggestion to exchange officers of the fighting forces, and in 1934 three German officers came to London, while three English officers went to the Berlin War Ministry. During the same year English armament firms placed huge advertisements in the Militaerisches Wochenblatt, offering for sale tanks and guns expressly prohibited by the Versailles Treaty. A statement made by General Sir Herbert Lawrence, chairman of Vickers, furnished the necessary evidence that the British Government knew about and approved these advertisements.

Such articles as this make it evident that the present confusion and treasonable proposals concerning the atomic bomb are largely prompted by the fact that these sordid sources, these infernal interests, are not sure the "right" side will possess it in the next war.

Although the strongest adjectives and invectives fail to adequately describe such a course of business policy, the procedure goes at least as far back as Napoleon. The French Emperor needed \$25-thousand to equip his army to battle against the English and Wellington, and he borrowed it from English banks. The conqueror of Europe, as many after him, acknowledged one enemy greater than Wellington. That enemy was the international banking combine. Napoleon once remarked: *"When a government is dependent for money upon bankers, the bankers, and not the leaders of that government, control the situation."* He aptly remarked another time: *"Money has no motherland; financiers are without patriotism and without decency. Their sole object is gain."* Anyone knowing the facts of recent history can make the same statements in all truth.

Probing the munitions racket after World War I uncovered facts which stagger the imagination and previews of coming investigations into World War II financial conspiracies are no less ominous. It is quite evident that International Finance fared better in the second world conflict than it did in the first. One of the previews, for example, shows that the U. S. Steel corporation, whose products are so vital a factor in war, showed a loss of \$6,524,001 in 1939 and a profit of \$95,688,091 in 1941. The operating profits over a comparable period shows an increase of \$178-million, a sum that would have purchased several war stamps.

Americans were not properly advised of such revelations as the following:

That the United States Steel Corporation and Bethlehem Steel Corporation charged Russia \$349 a ton for armor plate, Italy \$395 a ton, and Japan \$406, but these loyal and patriotic Americans charged the United States Government prices from \$411 to \$604 a ton for identical plate. The cost did not exceed \$315 a ton.

That thirty-seven percent of certain shell orders were delivered after the war ended. Some contracts which the government graciously permitted to be completed, even though never delivered, were held by French and British companies who did not want to shut down their factories.

That leading companies—all dominated by international financial interests—used war orders as a lever to expand plant capacity and obtain costly improvements at government expense. Many orders in no way required for victory were placed in their hands.

That between 1914–18 the profits of the J. P. Morgan corporation leaped to unknown heights. There is a dispute as to just what they were because the Morgan Company did not agree with the United States Senate. The Senate claimed the firm made \$131-million in 1914, \$348-million in 1916, \$585-million in 1917 and \$519-million in 1918, although the

Morgan Company claimed that \$444-million in the last two years, which was a good margin when the nation's best men were fighting and dying for \$30 a month.

That the Du Ponts, according to government investigators, had stooped so low as to bill the government \$75 for the burial of every worker who died during an influenza epidemic at the Old Hickory Powder Plant, and had sold the bodies for \$11 each as well. Industrial alcohol had been illegally withdrawn from the Old Hickory plant, it was also charged, and had been sold to Jess Smith, personal agent of Daugherty, for 30 cents a gallon. Smith resold at \$10 a gallon, making a profit of \$9.70 a gallon which he shared with persons unknown. A government investigator complained that his report exposing the complicated methods by which the Du Ponts had mulcted the government on a gigantic scale was shown by the Department of Justice to the Du Ponts so that lawyers might prepare a plausible defense. After repeated attempts to bring a voluminous and damning case against the Du Ponts to trial, First Assistant Attorney General John W. H. Crim blocked at every turn by Daugherty, resigned in disgust. The Du Ponts, politically powerful, arrogant, reactionary, were never prosecuted.

These examples are illustrative of and forceful corollaries to the already definitely established reasons for these forces putting the United States into the holocaust. As Lundbeg in his epic "America's 60 Families" writes:

"The rich families, to be sure, wanted the war to be won, but they took care that the victory was as expensive as possible to the common taxpayers. They uttered no cries for government economy, as since they have done, so long as the public Treasury was at their disposal. Economy became desirable only when government funds were to be expended on war veterans and on the unemployed."

It is a lie for anyone to say that in time of war the banks come forward with sacrifices, as all patriots should, and loan the government money at a very low rate of interest, to save the nation. The truth is Commercial banks never loan the government a red cent of their own money or of anybody else's money already on deposit. They "purchase" government bonds by creating pen and ink money out of nothing with nothing behind this credit money except the bond itself. Worse yet, they can post this bond with the Federal Reserve and get its face value in cash money by paying the cost of printing such money.

The money interests never base their friendships upon common ideals or any claims of gratitude; they have their roots always and invariably in their own self-interests. Britain would have made peace with Hitler in 1939 if she had thought she would be able to secure an advantageous and more or less durable treaty. How many Jews Hitler massacred and how many concentration camps he maintained—and what went on in them—would have

been held [by the international bankers] to be beside the point. And if Britain now shies away from Stalin's friendship it is because Stalin will not profit the bankers to the extent American blood and riches will.

The Senate Munitions Investigation Committee under the chairmanship of Senator Nye, of North Dakota rose above the sordid political chicanery in which it had its first breath of life to become one of the most systematic, impartial and fruitful investigations ever conducted by the Senate. In "America's 60 Families" it was stated as follows:

"Although one wing of the Du Pont bloc gave him (Roosevelt) support in 1932, his administration was to prove the most disastrous ever experienced by the munitions lords, for the President himself supported the Nye Munitions Investigating Committee which brought to view much Du Pont knavery. Apparently the Du Ponts felt that Roosevelt should have soft-pedaled this damaging inquiry early, as he subsequently did when it seemed likely to involve important British interests. The Du Ponts undoubtedly realized full well that no high principle actuated the New Deal leadership in permitting the Nye Committee to reveal them in as ugly a light as any rich family has ever been placed. They must have known, for example, how President Roosevelt terminated the Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigation of Wall Street as soon as it had successfully impugned New Deal foes and was logically ready to begin investigating the Wall Street machinations of high-ranking Democrats."

Well might Senator Nye say of the Committee what he said of one of its members, Senator Clark, of Missouri:

"May I say of him—the Senator from Missouri—at this time, that during these last few days he has had a large hand in the writing of history—history that may not be at once appreciated by America and Americans, but which another day will be basic to any intelligent undertaking looking to the recording of the facts prevalent during some of the most critical days of American history? The Senator from Missouri has contributed so emphatically in this making of history that there must in these hours be great rest and satisfaction in a certain grave where lie the remains of one who dared, back in those history-making hours, courageously uphold the finest traits and traditions which have entered into the making of America's finer historical pages. I have reference to the memory of the distinguished father of Missouri's able and courageous senior Senator."

Senator Clark's father, referred to, was the famous Champ Clark, a people's choice for the presidency and possible candidate until Colonel House as agent for the citadel of corrup-

tion discovered, made and elected Wilson. Champ Clark was one of the six Senators who voted against Wilson's request for a declaration of War. The deluge of derision heaped upon his head at the time has now become a crown of wisdom and patriotic courage.

The Morgan Company, while purchasing agents in the U. S. for Great Britain and France bought nearly three billion dollars worth of goods in behalf of the Allies, and made a profit of \$30-million on the deals. They also sold bonds of the Allies to Americans at still larger profits. Morgan and Company sold these bonds to raise money for Allied purchases because the Allies themselves did not have the resources to pay for their orders.

These bonds of England and France had no security behind them—only the word of England and France. These billions were in danger of becoming repudiated as the danger of English and French defeat approached. That is what was behind these words of the President of the Federal Reserve Board when he said:

"We will be forced to take up the cudgels for any of our citizens owning bonds that might be repudiated."

That is why it has been said that the bankers had bet on the wrong horse; they placed their stakes on the side that was losing.

Lord Northcliffe, who was in the United States as a British representative, sent to his government in 1917, when Treasury Secretary MacAdoo requested that someone in authority be sent to America to arrange for loans:

"They (financiers) are complete masters of the situation as regards themselves, Canada, France, Italy and Russia.... If Loans Stop, War Stops."

It is astounding to learn that Americans suffered and died to make good these involving loans of private bankers. But there is another fact equally startling, and even less known. It is: These loans with which world wars are fought are entirely fictional credit. In fact, there is not enough gold in the world to pay even the interest on these debts!

The nations' war debts were all contracted in gold and since there is scarcely \$20-billion worth of gold in existence, the interest of the fictional war debts of \$311-billion could not be met for a single year. The foreign Allies merely created credit with a stroke of the pen to wage wars for their ruthless rulers (financiers) and afterwards repudiate them to the government but not to the banks, as being unplayable.

In 1913, just before the outbreak of World War I the debts of 53 nations commercially affected, either directly or indirectly, totaled over \$43-billion. Then came the tremendous burden of wartime taxation as an extremely heavy addition. Despite the tax increase the debts of these same nations at the end of the war was over \$354-billion.

And the bankers collect taxes on that increased amount. Hence one grasps the increased profit to the banks in wars, as well as the increased burden to the citizens of these nations—the subjects are taxed for the luxuries of their masters. Who the subjects are and who the masters are, remains self-evident.

When foreign governments repudiate their war debts to the United States, or when the United States cancels them, the banks simply turn to the United States government to collect their interest. This burden in turn falls on the American citizen from whom the government collects under its power of taxation.

These debts on which the bankers collect interest are so enormous that they do not represent money at all. They are merely measured in a virtually endless string of figures with a dollar sign stuck in front of them. They are definite, but not real.

Thus the Banks collect on the fictional credit money of war debts the same as they do on the fictional credit money of national peacetime economy which constitutes 95% of the nation's money. Normal peacetime constitutes "business as usual" but the war-time deals bring a really heavy boom. Since one war every generation is about as much as people can take, "bargain sales" are offered in wars of smaller nations almost continuously somewhere in the world.

It is high time for beginning the basic remedy for wars, debts and oppression by permitting the Government to issue its own money which, under the Constitution, it and it alone has the right to do.

Chapter VIII

Round Two

"During the whole of this eight months (the 'phoney war' 1939-1940) lengthy negotiations were conducted by the British Foreign Office and Mr. Chamberlain' and the German Foreign Office and Hitler, by which from our side, we offered to stop the war if Germany would agree to a Gold Standard and International Usury, while Germany offered to stop the war if we would agree to allow her to develop her barter-trade system and give her back some of her colonies.... Then followed the Atlantic Charter meeting of Roosevelt and Churchill, attended by Mr. Montague Norman (Governor of the Bank of England), when, as stated above, Churchill pledged this country to support America's plan to get the world back again onto a Gold and Usury standard when Hitler was defeated." (From June-July number of "The Members Bulletin," England.)

"The war had been decided upon long before the Polish Corridor question turned up." (U. S. Ambassador Bullitt's statement to Karl von Wiegand in spring 1939, in Paris.)

Now let's see how and why.

"Who asked for revisions of the neutrality law? Was it American labor? Did the call come from the farmers? From the pulpit? From the homes of Americans? From American youth?

No, it came from the war hounds of Europe. It is supported by the manufacturers of munitions who are seeking the profit which they cannot make under the present law. If the law is revised and adopted according to the New Deal's program, the European war will become our war. Then, the old cry of save the world for democracy will arise again, as it did before when the United States entered the world conflict!

If the belligerents become financially pinched after two or three years of war, an effort will be made to collect for the munitions which they will have purchased in America and the burden will again fall on the American taxpayer. If I believed in going into this thing at all, I myself could not sap from the lives of helpless children a few dollars to get cash. You cannot be a national benefactor and a Shylock at the same time."

It is with a deep sense of guilt and with a heart weighed down by reverent respect for such statements as the above by Senator William E. Borah, spoken in opposition to the revision of the neutrality law in 1939, that Americans now contemplate their latest road to war. Speaking in the Senate against the enactment of peace time conscription, the words of another former Senator, those of Rush D. Holt, come back to haunt their readers:

"This bill is the old story of trade and money—the story that has led many a young man to have his head blown off on the battlefields of the world, the story that led many a young man to the living death of shell shock. These boys want jobs to live, not jobs to die. They want to build, not destroy. Their hope is the science of chemistry to make this a better world in which to live, not a world in which to spread poison gas. Their hope is the science of mathematics to build homes, not to draw charts for the dropping of bombs. Their hope is the march of progress, not the march of death. Conscription? For what? Everyone who is familiar with the developments in Washington knows that this conscription is for the possible use of the drafted overseas. Diplomatic reports state that those on the inside predict that we will be in the war this fall or next spring.

Some of the same financial institutions that made millions out of the last war are behind the spreading hysteria for our involvement in this one. The same international lawyers, who were later shown to be tied financially and employed by foreign governments and corporations in the last World War, are preaching that we 'take steps short of war' but they know that 'short of war' in the long run will mean the elimination of the phrase 'short of'.... One individual who has proclaimed that we should declare war and fight the battle over there does not in the same statement tell you of his financial holdings in airplane manufacturing concerns that build bombers, pursuit planes, and the like.

Our defense does not rest across the sea. It rests in every home in the land. It rests in our factories. It rests in our everyday life. It rests not upon the navy of any foreign power. It rests in you, one hundred and thirty million persons who know that America's hope is peace."

A book "Propaganda in the Next War," suppressed outside Britain proper, also knew what was going on behind the scenes and comes from England. It reveals the following:

"The next war (World War II) will be billed as a fight between democracy and dictatorship. We shall most certainly represent the struggle in the propaganda we shall be compelled to do toward France, the United States of America, and

our empire as a democracy and freedom versus dictatorship and dictatorship. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home to every citizen, before the Republic will again take up arms in an external quarrel. The position will be considerably eased if Japan were involved and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the great war (World War I) they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany."

In the English monthly, "The Word," Glasgow, was written:

"In considering a book by a pro-war author, Mr. Waverly Root, a writer in 'Reality' points out how the latter confirms the fact that Marion Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board and Montague Norman of the Bank of England agreed not later than 1935 on the joint policy of killing Hitler's financial experiment by all methods, including war, if necessary. Norman's job was to engineer Hitler into the dilemma of having to reverse his financial policy or commit an act of war. He was to deliver into Hitler's hands a secret ultimatum which virtually required him to keep the peace and at the same time destroy the trade and employment boom in Germany. The first condition meant that Hitler was not to acquire any real credit across Germany's border except by negotiations approved by Norman. The second meant that he was to put an end to the use of Germany's real credit except in the principles believed in by Norman and Eccles, which of course do not utilize a country's real credit to the full at all."

The "200-Family Monopoly" of France, "The Hundred Families That Rule the Empire" of Britain, and "America's Sixty Families" compose a Who's Who which tells the world What's What. Herein is found why America participated in another killing campaign with a profuse outpouring of blood which was belittled by the benefactors and a stupendous granting of money which was accepted with a sneer and without as much as a promise of intention of even partial payment. Herein is learned how truly independent the financial fakirs have left America, and how truly Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh could say:

"It is amazing that one should have to plead for American independence in a nation with a heritage such as ours; in a nation which in its infancy revolted against foreign control, and whose people have fought time and again against the armies and interference of the Old World. Yet the independence and the destiny of America were never more in jeopardy than they are today."

We won our independence from England when we were a nation of less than 4-million people. We numbered only about 10-million when the Monroe Doctrine was established. With a population of 35-million, even though we had just previously emerged from four years of Civil War, we made France remove her invading armies from Mexico. Later in the century with a population of 75-million we forced Spain to withdraw entirely from the New World.

Why then, with 130,000,000 people, are we being told that we must give up our independent position, that our frontiers lie in Europe, and that our destiny will be decided by European armies fighting upon European soil? . . .

We find the same men who have led us to the greatest national debt in our history, now telling us that as a nation we are weak and unprepared; that we must appropriate more billions of dollars, and devote more years of time to building up our military forces. ...These same leaders who have failed to solve our peacetime problems ...Tell us that the best way to defend our country is to defend England. All the lessons of Europe have passed unheeded before us."

Thus it is with truth that Former President Herbert Hoover in an interview article for the September 1947 issue of the American Magazine could say that America should have stayed out of World War II. Mr. Hoover stated what every informed person knows to be a fact, but what only a few have the courage to say. It is evident that the former President has no further political ambitions, for if he had, such a statement would have drowned his chances for success by raising the enmity of the monied plutocrats, of plunder and their shouting internationalists. Only a few had the intestinal fortitude to side with Hoover and yet only a few opposed his stand. This meager opposition is significant in view of the fact that it was safe politically to do so. That more did not attack Hoover's stand might be due to intellectual convictions that he was right.

The replies from 100 American professors of history and international relations to a questionnaire sent out by the National Council for Prevention of War are very illuminating. Here are the questions and answers on the two all-important topics:

Q. "Do you believe that Germany and her allies were solely responsible for causing the World War?

A. "Yes, 3; No, 95; Others, 2.

Q. "Do you believe that Germany was more responsible than any other power for causing the World War?

A. "Yes, 32; No, 56; Others, 12."

Back in 1932 the London International Bankers arranged with Dr. Schacht, President of the German Reichsbank, and Mr. Thyson, a German industrial baron, to finance internationalists' schemes in Germany. Hitler smashed this plot by dismissing Schacht who was merely the German representative of the international financial fraternity who was conducting the Reichsbank as a German branch of the international banking omniscient octopus. The official report of Schacht's dismissal crashed all newspaper propaganda gates. It was laughable to see the columns upon columns, all in the nature of a warm approbation of Dr. Schacht, whose *"financial genius and conservative financial methods had saved Hitler Germany from collapse,"* while Hitler was bitterly criticized because of his *"foolish act of ousting Schacht"*. Surely Hitler had made another of his many big mistakes, each one of which would be to emaciate Nazi Germany. That Germany became stronger stems from the ouster of this Dr. Schacht, international banker colleague, who in the vicious and curious logic of the money powers was a genius and the savior of Germany.

The first reaction was to wonder why the international bankers did not stage a dance of joy instead of expressing their deepest concern for Hitler. The explanation lies simply in recognizing who Schacht was, and, for that matter, still is. At present he is working with British and American zone officials on a plan of "financial reform" for Western Germany. Enough said. With that in mind, readers will find much significance in the acquittal of this same Dr. Schacht in the war trials of Nuremberg.

The story of the plot between Schacht and the London bankers is so vital to the understanding of the reasons for World War II, and was so well told in the House of Representatives by Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski during the 79th Congress that it is now quoted at some length:

"As early as 1923 the international do-gooders in America, who saw a lot of business and profit in Germany, started to rebuild Germany's war machine. Instead of murderers in World War I the international do-gooders now started to tell us how wonderful the German people really were. The international do-gooders now were telling us that America could not prosper unless Germany prospered.... If our boys who were killed in this war in Europe only knew that it was American money that was responsible for their death—international do-gooders never think of death—they think only about business and profit.

But this is just the beginning of the bloody trail of America's international do-gooders. Because in 1930 these greedy business manipulators said there is more business to be had from Germany if we would only make the German people more prosperous and happy. So in 1930 the international do-gooders put through the Young Plan and America gave Germany another loan of \$300-million. With this second loan from the U. S. A. the Krupp

munitions works got bigger and better and really started to turn out guns and gases. Herr Thyssen got some more money from this second U.S.A. loan and made more billions with which he later financed Hitler.

During all this time that America's international do-gooders were shedding tears for the poor German people, German taxes were lower than those in the U.S.A., France, Britain, or any other country of note. During this time when our international do-gooders were shedding tears for the poor German people, Germany built not one but seven stadiums in the world. U.S.A. could not afford even one for itself because the international do-gooders wanted it that way.... During this time Germany built railroads that not even the U.S.A. and Britain could afford....

We were beginning to get breadlines in America at this time while the German people accumulated savings accounts of \$3-billion.... Business gets better as wars get bigger. This is the type of thing our international do-gooders like Baruch specialize in. Between 1918 and 1932 our international do-gooders, bleeding for the poor people of Germany, got the U.S.A. to loan Germany \$1,364,000,000. Besides this American business men invested \$250-million during the same time. During this time we also stepped up our exports to Germany to be sure Germany would not starve and that she had everything she wanted. This type of thing took place until 1937 when Hitler announced to the world that the sucker game was over. . .

Who made Hitler? Nobody but America's international do-gooders gave Hitler the money to make the weapons that killed our boys.... The fact is that without America's help Hitler never could have become so powerful as he did. It was America's help that built Germany. It was America's help that financed Germany's war machine. We were depriving ourselves of everything. But the international do-gooders said we cannot prosper unless Germany prospered. So we made Germany prosper so much that as a result 800,000 of our own boys paid with blood to destroy Germany again."

There is voluminous evidence to prove the charge that the United States built up Germany and established Hitler in power. For example, two volumes of Foreign Relations for 1930, published by the American State Department shows that American bankers, chiefly J. P. Morgan and Company, gave Germany a credit of \$300-million for the year 1930.

It would be an error to say, as Representative O'Konski implies, that American interests were totally responsible for all Hitler's power and progress. These interests did give him his start. He accepted their money and used their Reichsbank until he saw their pur-

pose. Hitler then established a system which began by kicking the international bankers out of office, and ended in a happy and prosperous country; so much so that the London Times openly avowed that British financial and economic authorities were staggered by the “miraculous feat of Nazi finance.”

People wondered why Germany had no difficulty in financing the war, why she did not have to increase taxation, compulsory savings, or issue enormous war loans. Instead Germany managed to cut taxes during the war, public savings banks touched new records month after month. Money was so plentiful that interest on State loans was reduced.

It was simply that after using the international bankers for a start, Hitler evolved a national policy that was much superior to their own. It was because his success was overcoming the old system as practiced by the international bankers that caused them to bring into play their plan for war—a plan formulated at the beginning of his experiment.

The Economic Reform Club and Institute, of London, said in their monthly bulletin for December, 1940:

“Another hierarchy has fallen. For years we have hung on the words of these great men, these experts, at whose lightest word Britain would stop to listen; these bankers, from whom, year in and year out, statesmen and captains of industry obediently took their orders. And now the oracles are dumb. The veil of wisdom is rent, disclosing a fifty-year-old gramophone bound in hide. The seat of economic authority is vacant. Where shall we turn for guidance?

The pill is not easy to swallow but in our search for economic wisdom we must turn straight from the Bank of England to Hitler, not stopping at the London School of Economics. Having now commended our great economic experts to the care of the museum authorities, we turn to our new tutors.

What is the secret of Hitler’s financial miracle? Here further shocks await us. Everything is upside down. The State controls the banks (instead of the banks controlling the State). Monetary policy is subservient to national interest. Credit is based upon productive capacity (not debt) thus enabling Hitler to use all the labor, material and equipment that he has.

The prospect is disturbing. Applied to peace-time industries, instead of armaments, such a monetary system would result in an overwhelming output of wealth. Used by a democratic state in the interests of the people, there would be nothing to prevent the entire population from having enough to eat and wear.”

The real reasons for the international bankers taking over Hitler and Germany were:
(1) When Hitler and Germany were prepared, Germany would attack Russia and thus end

the danger of Communism sweeping through Europe. (2) After a long and destructive war between Germany and Russia, both countries would be so exhausted that England and France would find it easy to quickly suppress what was left of Germany and Russia, and then could recover their European markets, restore their Balance of Power and remove any future threat of Russian influence in Persia, Turkey or India.

Six years later in 1938, after Hitler kicked out the conspirator clique of international bankers and established a sound national monetary system and brought prosperity, and after Germany had built up a large and modern navy, a mechanized army and a large air-force, and had taken Austria and Czechoslovakia; Prime Minister Chamberlain met Mr. Hitler in the now famous conference at Godesburg.

In "Forty Years of Roosevelt," T. W. Hughes tells of this conference as follows:

"At this conference Mr. Chamberlain plaintively reminded Mr. Hitler that he had been given the money (international banker money) to rearm Germany; upon Mr. Hitler's definite promise that he would then attack Russia; And now that Germany was re-armed, the Rhineland fortified and Czechoslovakia out of the way, why didn't Mr. Hitler keep his promise and attack Russia? Mr. Hitler replied evasively that he still needed more time for preparation; and that being the best answer Mr. Chamberlain could get, he made his sorrowful return to London. But at this conference Mr. Hitler had out-smarted Mr. Chamberlain, for the Prime Minister's words had all been taken down on a dictograph record and the record put aside for future use.

Some months later when it was clear that Hitler was double-crossing the International Bankers who had financed him and was not going to attack Russia, English agents went to Moscow and for two months tried to persuade Stalin to start a war against Germany. For that matter what did the International Bankers care whether Stalin or Hitler started the war, so long as both Russia and Germany would be exhausted by the war, and thus make it easy for the Big Bankers to regain control of Europe as above explained?

At the last moment when it seemed Stalin might sign up with Britain and France, Von Ribbentrop took his dictograph-record in which Mr. Chamberlain had reminded Mr. Hitler that Germany had been re-armed for an attack on Russia.

Von Ribbentrop then said to Stalin, 'Do you now see the plot whereby Russia and Germany were to destroy each other so that the International Bankers through the armies of England and France could restore their Balance of

Power in Europe?’ Stalin did see; and startled the world by announcing an alliance with Germany.”

An astounding side-light on this period of war preliminaries was written by Mr. Ladislas Farago in Ken magazine and inserted in the Congressional Record. He wrote in part:

“While there can be no doubt of the sincerity of Mr. Chamberlain’s love of peace? his ultimate aim was the guiding motive which induced him to fly to Berchtesgaden and to Godesberg. The Four-Power conference in Munich, a long desired dream of Herr Hitler, was the climax of a scheme prepared four years ago by the directors of the Bank of England, in cooperation with an influential Carlton club clique and with the heads of Britain’s armament factories.

Hitler had disappointed his critics. His regime was no temporary nightmare but a system with a good future. and Mr. Norman (head of the Bank of England) advised his directors to include Hitler in their plans.”

As for Mussolini’s subservience to Hitler, it was Britain’s and France’s fault, not the Duce’s. For in their blind attempt to uphold the status quo, the so-called democracies pursued such a warlike and menacing policy toward Italy that Mussolini was literally driven into the arms of the Nazis.

Until recent years Italy was on excellent terms with Britain, France and the other status quo powers. She was a member of the League of Nations, a signatory of the Locarno Pact and the head of the Italian government, Benito Mussolini, consistently voiced his disapproval of the use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

The Duce put his words into practice by his action on July 25, 1934. On that day Nazi terrorists murdered Austrian Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss, barricaded themselves in government buildings in Vienna and waited for German troops to march in and annex Austria to the Reich.

Within 48 hours of the putsch the Duce had sent 100,000 Italian troops to the Brenner Pass to warn Adolf Hitler that Italy would resist any Nazi interference in Austrian affairs. At the same time Mussolini called on France to uphold her part of an Anglo-French-Italian Treaty safeguarding Austria’s independence by mobilizing troops on the Rhine and threatening to march if Germany attacked Vienna.

This the French government refused to do. Nevertheless Italy’s prompt action forestalled the attempted anschluss and saved Austria for the international bankers. Otto Planetta, the Nazi ringleader, was sent to the gallows; the German ambassador was recalled; and 15,000 putschists were put in concentration camps.

Having left him in the lurch during the Austrian affair, the democratic powers further provoked Mussolini by the Franco-Soviet pact, which was signed on November 23, 1934. Drawn up by the Frenchman, Leon Blum and the Russian Maxim Litvinov-Finkelstein, the pact marked the official entrance of Red Russia into European power politics and contained secret military articles directed against both Germany and Italy.

The Duce, though still endeavoring to maintain friendly relations with Britain and France, warned that the Franco-Soviet pact was a dangerous threat to world peace and would in the end reduce Europe to a shambles. The war demonstrated the accuracy of this prophecy.

The Treaty of London in article 15 insisted that Italy muzzle the Pope in his plea for peace. Nice people, these democracies who talk of peace and plan for war!

Just as in 1912 with the first World War brewing in Europe the Big Bankers wanted Wilson in the White House and wanted America to finance their war, so in 1932 with the second World War brewing in Europe they wanted Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House, and again wanted America to finance the war. Thus whether Americans like it or not, it happened that in the summer of 1932 the International Bankers had two candidates running for the position of Chief Executive: Franklin D. Roosevelt in the United States and Adolph Hitler in Germany. That is how they both came to be elected.

Of these two men, Roosevelt happened to be in a land under the domination of international finance and, in fact, was himself an international banker. Perhaps that is why he could say “again and again and again” that he would not send American boys to foreign shores while plotting that very event; that is why Roosevelt was praised as the statesman of the world for giving Britain 50 American destroyers, while Benedict Arnold is called a traitor for trying to give to Britain a single unimportant fort. True, Roosevelt did not give them to an avowed enemy, but to a competitor, and also committed an act which would involve this country in the war and lessen the American forces to the extent of 50 destroyers. This deprived America of many of her effective anti-submarine vessels when submarines were the chief enemy weapon against American forces going abroad.

One of the most important statements given on Roosevelt and his international monetary intrigue was given in a speech by the Honorable John C. Schafer in the House of Representatives, Friday, June 30, 1939 and recorded in the Congressional Record of that date, P. 8463. It is a safe bet that scarcely one out of a million ever heard of the speech although it would have revealed much in the way of disillusionment. The statement is as follows:

“The Washington Post of June 18th, in an Associated Press report, made the following statement: ‘President Roosevelt told Congress today it would undermine the National Defense and return control of money to Wall Street

and international bankers if it refused to continue his power to devalue the dollar.' This is a rather remarkable statement.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of page 31 of the New York Times of September 14, 1922, in which appears an advertisement of a new issue of 600,000,000 German marks, floated by United European Investor, Ltd., Franklin D. Roosevelt, President.

I have a photostatic copy of page 1430 of Poor's Register of Directors, 1929, wherein Franklin Delano Roosevelt is shown as a director of The International Germanic Trust Co.

I have here a copy of the prospectus and photostats of other records of the Federal International Banking Corporation, indicating that Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote the Foreword of the prospectus for this International banking outfit, and was hooked up in it with Robert Rowland Appleby, president of the British Empire Chamber of Commerce in the United States. His International Banking Corporation, according to its prospectus, was organized for the selling of foreign securities and bonds to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, in view of Mr. Roosevelt's international banking record, it is rather astounding for him to tell the Congress that it would 'Return control of money to Wall Street and International Bankers if it refused to continue his power to devalue the dollar.'

Our New-Deal President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is an international banker of wide experience and former attorney for international bankers. Under his gold and silver policies the international bankers, foreign owners of, and speculators in gold, waxed fat when Mr. Roosevelt forced Americans to turn in their gold for \$20.67 an ounce or to go to jail for five years, and then imported more than \$10-billion (since more than doubled) worth of foreign gold at \$35 an ounce. "Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt did not drive the money changers out of the temple of government. He drove them into the temple with the help of his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, the son of Morgenthau, the international banker, who married the favorite niece of Lehman Brothers, who are among the most powerful international bankers in America."

No wonder he was the worst and most un-American of presidents.

The simple cause of the tragedy lies in the fact that America and her leaders championed money while the enemy championed work. America, the great democracy, was

caught on the wrong side of the problem and fought to keep on being wrong. With her were the other “great co-operating allies.”

Although American co-operation with England in the first war was insignificant compared with the cost of the late conflict, it is worth knowing and remembering. The figures are presented on the first World War because they are more definite; furthermore, there is no special need to hurry to the scattering and debatable figures of the late war when the lesson of the former carnage has not yet been learned. Cooperation with England in World War I cost America as follows:

Seven billions loaned during the war; seven billions paid her for her worthless stock, our supply of machinery and gold; 27 billions spent during the war for her war; 25 more billions of federal debts accumulated because of the war; after the war, 50 billions now owing by city, county and state governments, because of inability to balance their budgets during these depression times largely made by English bankers, and more than 200 billions for 11 years of extremely contracted production; a grand total of 316 billions of loss suffered for the privilege of “co-operating” with England “to make the world safe for democracy.”

England, in turn, could say: “*The war has cost us nothing*” (Lloyd George). They had gotten the German colonies of great value, the German navy, the German merchant marine, the German gold and German machinery, also her military equipment and livestock so that millions of German babies might perish, and billions of indebtedness of foreign nations to England for money borrowed from her during the war England lent billions to European nations, with the necessary collateral for safe refund, while she borrowed from us with not a gesture of refund when due. For 20 years after the war England has kept on collecting the debts owed by France, Italy and other European nations, while refusing to pay her own debt to America, with our people starving because of the misery brought over us by England. No wonder, Lloyd George even boasted: “*England made a profit out of the war.*”

It would be thought that, after such experiences we would have learned our lesson. The American people as a whole had, but they were again in the hands of the same “co-operators” and so the cruel game went on with even more gigantic takes. They were again paying in money, wealth and blood and sweat and tears. But without control over distribution by means of a reliably circulating money, they faced the greatest tragedy in the history of our nation, and maybe in the history of the world.

Germany had kicked out the international banker and established a sound monetary system based upon the exchangeable wealth of the nation without gold or tribute to the Money Power.

“We were not foolish enough to try to make a currency coverage of gold of which we had none, but for every mark that was issued we required an

equivalent of a mark's worth of work done or goods produced."
-Adolph Hitler.

What heresy! Little pieces of paper made Germany in six years a nation whose power challenged the world, because those little pieces of paper put people to work, gave them food, unified them behind their leaders, and built a happy and prosperous country.

The key to the vault from which Hitler got the means to lead his nation out of the depression, on to capacity employment and ever increasing capacity production is found in Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the American Constitution. There it is stated in simple, insignificant words pregnant with fateful importance; That Congress shall have the power to coin (issue) money and regulate the value thereof. Some intellects with a Churchill-like complex would undoubtedly call the American Constitution "fascistic" for that reason, but it was sound Americanism long before fascism or Churchill's childish sophistry were ever heard of.

Germany and Italy both ignored orthodoxy and fed their people by exchanging their industrial products for the food they could not produce themselves. They were condemned by the world's "economic experts." Barter was not accepted as legitimate trade. It did not gather interest. Trade was trade, in the opinion of the money power, only when men stood at ports entering cargoes into ledgers "Imports and Exports." Barter only fed people and proved that the "orthodox economists" were most unorthodox.

Germany, like Italy and Russia before, was trying to escape the entanglements of world debt. England was quite willing to lend money to buy raw materials, but Germans insisted upon exchanging goods for goods. They would not be drawn into the system of increasing debt, booms and slumps. The "Times" has since said that Germany's barter system made her an aggressor in the world market.

On October 11 and 12 and November 13, 1940, this organ of High Finance said:

"One of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough foreign markets to straighten her finances at the very time when all her competitors were forced by their own debts to adopt exactly the same course. Continuous friction was inevitable."

Germany adopted a new monetary policy after which, the "Times" said:

"Germany ceased to experience any financial difficulty. In this country the people suffer the burden of heavy and increasing taxation, but in Germany, says The Times, nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory savings, or the issue of enormous public war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently an important tax was abolished. Public savings bank deposits touch new monthly records again and again. Money is so plentiful that

the interest rate on the Reich loans could recently be reduced from 4 1/2 percent to 4 percent. Hitler seems to have discovered the secret of making something out of nothing, and to have evolved a system based on perpetual motion.

These changes may well call for drastic readjustments in our established conventions. A hidebound persistence of methods and doctrines which were sound fifty years ago may easily prove as costly in the financial and economic field of actual war. It might not lose the war; it would certainly lose the peace”.

Germany was trying to break the credit ring of the money monopolists by the force of economic sanity—and that was unforgivable. She was acting like the worker who went on strike against a system which deprived him of adequate food supplies though he was quite willing to exchange his labor to pay for them. In 1937 Hitler said:

“Germany will enter no more obligations to pay for her goods imports that she is not capable of fulfilling. The German Government thus takes the standpoint of the respectable merchant who keeps his orders in harmony with his power to pay.”

He said:

“We laugh at the time when our national economists held the view that the value of a currency is regulated by the gold and securities lying in the vaults of a State Bank; and more especially we laugh at the theory that its value was guaranteed thereby. We have instead come to learn that the value of the currency lies in the productive capacity of a nation.”

“Hitler’s Official Program,” published in 1938 by Unwin Bros., London, tells about the following evil intentions of this man—against the money power:

“(1) We demand the abolition of all unearned incomes.

(2) –personal enrichment through war must be regarded as a crime against the nation. We demand the ruthless confiscation of all war profits.

(3) We demand a generous provision for old age.

(4) The common interest before self interest, that is the spirit of our program.

(5) Abolition of the thrallldom of interest, that is the kernel of National Socialism.

(6) The power of money, most brutal of all powers, holds absolute sway and exercises a corrupting and destroying influence on State, Nation, Society, Morals, Drama and Literature. There must be no wavering, no drawing back in this battle of giants; it is either victory or extinction.

(7) The general welfare is the supreme law.

(8) Finance shall exist for the benefit of state, the financial magnates shall not form a State within a State.

(9) Usury and profiteering and personal enrichment at the expense, and to the injury of the Nation shall be punished with death.

(10) The duty of the State is to provide the necessities of life, and not to secure the highest possible rate of interest for capital."

That was the soundest economic platform written in recent ages. No wonder it was so successful in its purpose. No wonder a poll of American G. I.'s showed that a startlingly high proportion of them believed "Hitler did the Reich a lot of good before 1939" and that Germany had some reasons for going to war. No wonder Lloyd George, England's World I leader, after a personal visit said of Hitler:

"There is no doubt that Hitler, so far as Germany is concerned, is the resurrection and the life." "He is the savior of Germany, a great and wonderful leader;" "He is the George Washington of Germany."

No wonder the world financial monopolies stood aghast and then decided upon the eradication of this program.

If Germany succeeded in her plan of economic penetration, other nations would undoubtedly follow her example. The whole world would then exchange goods for goods on the basis of equality and good fellowship. No one would want to borrow and no one would have debts to pay. But it is from the pyramid of debt that the Money Power rules the world. Thus Russia had incurred hostility for refusing to pay her debts, and Germany incurred hostility for refusing to contract new ones.

If the German monetary experiment had been permitted to develop on the basis of a friendly exchange of goods it would have provided the world with information to assist in solving commercial problems. Nations of the world would be well fed—but the financiers would lose their power and their profits. The big bankers were alarmed at the success of Germany's money just as their families were alarmed generations ago at the success of Lincoln's money. The very words of consternation uttered at Lincoln equally describe their chagrin at Hitler's progress, namely:

"If that mischievous financial policy . . . should become indurated down to a fixture, then that government will furnish its own money without cost. It will pay off its own debts and be without debt. It will have all the money necessary to carry on its own commerce. It will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilized countries of the world."

What might have been a laudable program on the part of Germany was thus the principal cause of World War II. The fight between rival monetary policies was inevitable. The main object now was to find or, if necessary, make an "incident"—an excuse to say:

"Germany wants War! Hitler wants to rule the world! We must fight for Christianity, civilization, and the four freedoms everywhere!"

At a meeting of the Chicago Flagship, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Theodore W. Miller, Past County Judge Advocate of the V.F.W. stated:

"If the international bankers and their controlled press were actually sincere in wanting to prepare against invasion by Hitler, they would do so by making this country economically sound. But they are not interested in making this country economically sound. It is their international banking racket, based on gold, that they want to preserve with our lives and resources. These same international bankers dominated France, through their control of the Bank of France. Once these international bankers dominated Germany, through their control of the Reichsbank, but not any longer. That is why Germany is now economically the soundest nation in Europe if not in the whole world. These international bankers, headed by the Rothschilds and Morgan, still dominate England, through their control of the Bank of England. They dominate the United States and its servile government, through their control of the Federal Reserve bank and its member banks."

That is why Hitler failed in his attempted alliance with England. It will startle most people to learn that such a proposal was seriously offered by Hitler, yet such is a fact.

A witness (Dahlerus) said Hitler's proposals, which he took to 10 Downing street on Aug. 27, 1939, for submission to Chamberlain, Foreign Minister Halifax, and others were,

1. Germany would sign a pact of alliance with Britain.
2. England would help Germany obtain Danzig and the Polish corridor, but give the Poles the use of Danzig's port.
3. Germany would guarantee Poland's sovereignty.

4. *Agreement on Germany's former colonies.*

5. *"Adequate guarantees" on the treatment of the German minority in Poland.*

6. *Germany would pledge to "defend the British empire with the German Wehrmacht wherever it might be attacked."*

Before handing over the proposals, Dahlerus said, Hitler upbraided the British and asked bitterly why he found it impossible to reach an agreement with Britain. It is evident that Hitler did not realize the extent to which the International Bankers dominated England.

A few months after the ceasing of hostilities in Europe, it was frankly admitted in the press that Germany not only did not prepare for conquering the world, but had not even prepared for conquering her most obvious enemy, England. The fact is that Germany never wanted war with England or France but these latter did want war with Germany. They declared war against Germany when the Polish war trap was sprung as set by England, by encouraging Poland's resistance against Germany's justified demand for a correction of the Polish Corridor injustice, an injustice generally recognized as such the world over, and also by inducing Poland's intolerable provocation of border violations. National Unity, which every other nation is free to claim for itself, was simply to be denied to the Germans. It was incompatible with England's balance-of-power policy.

England, regardless of what her statesmen may claim, was not concerned as to the form of government in Germany, but she was much concerned in the success of the Hitler monetary system through which the control of money and the value thereof was completely in the hands of the government. It is not so in England, where the Bank of England, like the Federal Reserve System here at home and the bank of France in France, is privately controlled and manipulated, not for the interest of the people but in the interest of those who control gold and credit.

It was for this reason that the war was fought in Europe, that the youth of the belligerent nations was sacrificed in this contest between governmental control and private control of the monies of the world.

After learning these facts surely no one can help but realize that the "*Unnecessary War*" was a Money Lord's War.

At a meeting of the Economic Reform Club and Institute, London, England, Nov. 15, 1942, the existing gold situation was discussed. The opinion was generally expressed that it would not be far wrong to say that the war is being waged between the Allies, who are on a gold exchange standard, and the Axis powers, who want to rule out, altogether, gold as a basis of currency.

The meeting agreed that there are indications of a well laid and maturing plan to put us all back on the gold basis as soon as possible after cessation of hostilities; and the probable underlying meaning of it all is the establishment of a financial system based on gold to operate the economic controls of a proposed world federation.

In this connection may it be remembered that one of the demands of President Roosevelt to Japan in the pre-war discussions was that Japan drop her monetary system (which by expansion endangers the interest exploitation) and adopt the American-British system (which by contraction safeguards interest exploitation.)

The war and the peace would be lost by the democratic nations of the world—no matter how victorious in the end on the battlefield—if these nations would tolerate being again fettered by the bonds of the gold money too short for the distribution of capacity production at the existing price levels.

Old Marshall Petain's trial in Paris brought into the news the name of Georges Mandel, former head of the House of Rothschild, whose real name was Jeroboam Rothschild, close adviser to Clemenceau when the Versailles alleged peace-treaty was written. The charge against the old Marshall was "*he caused the death of Georges Mandel.*" If that charge was true then Petain was guilty of an unpardonable sin against International Finance, for he killed the worst enemy France ever had.

When the impregnable Maginot Line against the Germans on the east border of France was completed, part of the Government and all the people of France wanted further protection by continuing the wall from its north end to the sea. Such a wall would have saved France but would have led, no doubt, to an invasion of England and the end of the British Empire. The Bankers refused a loan for further construction, and so France later fell to the Germans who flanked the wall in the defenseless discontinued sector.

At the time Jeroboam Rothschild (Georges Mandel) was in the French cabinet, along with his puppet Premier, Paul Reynaud. They defeated the project which could have saved France militarily and they are the guilty ones. Petain may have been guilty too; the point is not the defense of any dictator, only the prosecution of the real criminals. The fall of France and of every nation, including the planned fall of the American Republic, is the work of the same gang of criminals, the International Financiers.

Like World War I, the late war was not national, it was not even racial. It was economic. And economic systems are dominated, controlled and operated by the chief agents of finance, the international bankers.

There was no quarrel between the peoples of the United States and the people of Germany. The only exchange of arguments was one diplomatic tilt between Roosevelt and Hitler with the American President getting the soundest beating any national leader ever received at the hands of the leader of another nation in the whole history of diplomacy.

Because Roosevelt's message was an ultimatum in disguise, because the exchange was the nearest thing to a disagreement between the two countries and because the newspapers and other media of propaganda covered the matter up for history, it is well to review the facts here. The argument could not for obvious reasons be played up as a cause for hostilities nor to hide the real reasons. Other causes than the guilt of international finance had to be found. Unjust aggression was finally hit upon although England and Russia, beloved allies, stood even more guilty than did Germany.

Mr. Roosevelt began his message by expressing the concern of the Western Hemisphere for the fear of a new war or series of wars. Hitler observed what even a schoolboy diplomat should have known; that since the treaty of Versailles fourteen wars were waged, *"in none of which Germany was concerned, but in which the States of the Western hemisphere, in whose name President Roosevelt also speaks, were indeed concerned."*

In addition, he pointed out there were in the same period (1919-38) twenty-six violent interventions and sanctions in which Germany had no part while the United States carried out military interventions in six cases since 1918.

To Mr. Roosevelt's opinion that every major war must have serious consequences for generations to come, Hitler remarked that the German people were made to learn this better than any other peoples because the treaty of Versailles imposed burdens on the German people which could not have been paid off in a hundred years, although it had been proved precisely by American teachers of Constitutional law, historians, and professors of history that Germany was no more to blame for the outbreak of the war than any other nation.

Mr. Roosevelt declared that three nations in Europe and one in Africa have had their independence terminated. As regards the three nations of Europe, the answer was that the Allies themselves did that when in 1918 in the treaty of Versailles, contrary to solemn promises, the nations were separated from their communities and forced into a dependence upon an international foreign world which they hated. As regards the one nation in Africa, practically all the peoples of Africa, such as the Moroccans, Berbers, Arabs, and Negroes, for example, have fallen to foreign might, the swords of which were not inscribed "Made in Germany," but "Made by Democracies."

Mr. Roosevelt said that no peoples should go to war except in the cause of self-evident home defense. Hitler pointed out that in World War I American soldiers invading the shores of Europe hardly did so in defense of their homes. He also observed that a research committee set up by President Roosevelt himself (the Nye Investigation) had examined the cause of American entry into the Great War and reached the conclusion that the entry ensued chiefly for exclusively capitalistic reasons, and that nevertheless, no practical conclusions have been drawn from this fact.

Mr. Roosevelt also declared that it was clear to him that all problems could be solved at the conference table. Hitler pointed out that *"America herself gave the sharpest expression of her mistrust in the effectiveness of conferences."* The conference table was not even used in the war between the States when every condition favored its use. The United States was the first nation to refuse to join the greatest conference of all times, the League of Nations.

As for this conference settling anything, not one instance can be cited of a decisive solution of a single international problem. If every problem can be solved at the conference table, then every nation, including the United States, has been led for the past 800 years by blind or criminal men.

Mr. Roosevelt's chief object in the message was to get assurance that:

"The German armed forces will not attack, and above all, not invade, the territory or possessions of the following independent nations: Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Great Britain, Ireland, France, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Poland, Hungary, Turkey, Iraq, the Arabias, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Iran."

Whoever wrote that part of the President's speech which included Ireland and Palestine, should have been attending night school. It was easy for Hitler to point to the speech of the Prime Minister of Ireland (de-Valera) who charged England, not Germany, with oppressing Ireland and subjecting her to continuous aggression, and then add:

"With all due respect to Mr. Roosevelt's insight into the needs and cares of other countries, he may nevertheless be assured that the Irish Prime Minister will be more familiar with the dangers which threaten his country than the President of the United States."

Hitler then noted that it was English, not German, troops which occupied Palestine; and that in this case England was not defending herself against evident Arab attack on the British homeland which Roosevelt wanted as the only excuse for war. Without being called upon to do so, was endeavoring to establish her power in a foreign territory which did not belong to her.

The German leader answered the reference to all the nations listed by President Roosevelt by first ascertaining from the States mentioned that not even one felt itself menaced by Germany and that the inquiry addressed by the American was not sent with even their consent, much less its suggestion. Hitler then made the following offer:

"The German Government is nevertheless prepared to give each of the States named an assurance of the kind desired by Mr. Roosevelt on the condition of

absolute reciprocity, provided that the State wishes it and itself addresses to Germany a request for such an assurance together with appropriate proposals."

The peace pact was intended to be effective for ten years. Several years ago Hitler appealed to the League of Nations for a 25-year peace and was turned down. A 10-year peace was desirable by its erstwhile supporters in 1939.

When Roosevelt asked Hitler to make to the nations of the world a statement "*on the present policy of the German Government,*" Hitler noted that many important statements of German policy made by him are either withheld from the democratic peoples or distorted by their press, then said:

"If President Roosevelt thinks he is qualified to address such a request to Germany . . . we on our side might, with the same right, address to the President of the American Republic the question as to what aim American foreign policy has in view in its turn."

When Mr. Roosevelt called for disarmament, Hitler called attention to his previous proposal for a maximum strength for all armies of 200,000, to his proposal for the abolition of all offensive weapons, of bombing planes, poison gas, etc. When these were refused, Hitler offered to raise the maximum to 300,000 and no one even deigned to discuss the matter.

Instead of throwing a mad fit, raging at the democracies, shouting German defiance, immediately rushing to war or grabbing a few more territories as he was evidently supposed to do, Hitler treated the Roosevelt message with the sincerity and respect it did not deserve. The world-famous message was not the plea for peace it was advertised as being; it was an ultimatum of war, a last warning issued to the dictatorships that the democracies would resist aggression with aggression.

Acting upon the suggestion of former British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, the America State Department stigmatized Italy, Japan and Germany as aggressor nations, but it was noticed that at the same time Britain entered into secret agreements with Italy and Japan and Germany—the now famous Chamberlain-Halifax treaties. Even an amateur in international diplomacy would have recognized that America had committed an act of war and had been double-crossed by Britain.

At the time of the Munich Conference following the Czech crisis it was known that Chamberlain, Daladier, Mussolini and Hitler had entered into certain agreements regarding the annexation and acquisition of new territories. Britain and France agreed that the Reich should re-acquire territories taken from Germany in the iniquitous Versailles treaty—provided the Reich did not move for the annexation of former colonial territories now held by Great Britain. The democracies agreed with Italy that Mussolini might annex lands that

were promised to Italy in 1914 as the price for the betrayal of the Triple Entente-promises that were never fulfilled. Hence, Chamberlain and Daladier determined upon the so-called appeasement policy in order to disguise the concessions which their democracies had granted to the so-called dictatorships.

Following the Munich Conference the State Department embarked upon a program of taunting belligerence. It framed trade policies which were concessions to favored nations and sanctions against the dictatorships—secret trade agreements which were for practical purposes treaties; pacts with certain nations, and economic and political sanctions against other nations. It is dreadfully apparent that the State Department acted beyond its limits in making unconstitutional commitments with foreign nations—unconstitutional because the framing and ratifying of treaties belongs only to the United States Congress.

Concerning the ostensible cause of the war, the Polish case let it be recorded that Germany had every just reason for the annexation of Danzig. Either the treaty of Versailles was in effect or it was not in effect; there is no other alternative. If it was in effect Danzig belonged to Germany because according to the terms of the treaty minorities were self-determinant, that is, they could by a free choice join whichever power they cared to! Danzig was estimated to be 96 percent pro-German, wanted to return to the German government and the people were refused a chance to express their free choice. If the Versailles treaty were not in effect, then that portion which created the free city of Danzig was not effective and the situation reverted to the status it was previous to the treaty's enactment. At that time Danzig was a part of Germany.

Concerning the United States-Japanese peace negotiations of 1941, it will be noted that the same method of approach was used as Roosevelt applied against Hitler. And the answers, self evident, are equally as humiliating as those supplied by Hitler.

The United States wanted Japan to quit the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis. Japan could by the same logic have demanded that the United States quit the United States-London axis. The United States wanted the Jap[anese] to get out of China. Japan could by the same logic have demanded that the United States get out of Iceland, New Guinea and the bases leased from England. The United States demanded Japan withdraw her troops from Indo-China as evidence of good intentions Japan could by the same logic have demanded that the United States withdraw supplies from Libya as evidence of good intentions. The United States wanted Japan to stop aiding Germany. Japan could by the same logic have demanded the United States stop aiding England.

Roosevelt, as tool of the internationalists, and one time member of their clique, timed his ultimatums to Germany and Japan perfectly. The "steps short of war" were, as he knew, steps to war. These steps as listed by Senator Books of Illinois were as follows:

(1) We passed a law called the neutrality law. That was to prevent our getting into their next war. And, in the short span of a few months, all the promise that we would stay out of the war and the pretext of building our own national defense, we have quickened our step....

(2) We changed our neutrality law to sell goods to those people fighting for liberty. But to obtain that change in the law both the Executive branch and Members of the Congress pledged that all sales would be for cash-and-carry, and that it would keep war away from our shore.

(3) Then came the original conscription bill. They said it was only for our own defense. The administration and Members of Congress pledged that these men would be taken only for 1 year, and that they would not be taken beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere. Who could be so unpatriotic as not to be willing to serve 1 year to prepare himself to protect our home and our shore? "It was a pledge and it was a promise. It was another step.

(4) Then we were told that Britain needed our airplanes and tanks, and that we must sell them to them even though we didn't have enough to train the men we were calling into service. But that was done.

(5) The law forbade our selling these war implements, but we got around the law by calling them obsolete even though they were of our latest design and the best we had. Still they found a way to sell them. They said it was to keep war away from our shore.

(6) Then Britain said she needed our destroyers. The law forbade it. But we called them obsolete, too. And we were told that we were trading them for bases. Britain got our ships. We got the right to negotiate for and to purchase bases, and to pay for them with cash.

(7) Then came the lease-lend bill. They said it was needed to prevent our becoming involved in the war. Some of us who opposed it said that if one man, namely the President, was given all the power to distribute our military and naval equipment throughout the world, that it was bound to involve us because he would naturally ask them what they needed it for, and sit in and advise them in the conduct of the war, which naturally would involve us. We were assured that this would not happen.

(8) Then came the problem of production, and a priority system was established. Certain strategic materials were curtailed, and our factories throughout the country began even then to feel that they would soon be faced with

shortages that might result in losses or even closing down of their plants completely. But they were told it was to keep us out of the war.

(9) Then the Chief Executive ordered ships of the countries of the world who were fighting those we chose to aid seized in our harbors. Then Congress was again asked to pass a law to give authority for that which had already been done.

Another step. But, of course, they said, to keep us out of the war.

(10) The United States Army moved in on men who were striking for a living wage in a factory that produced airplanes, 90 percent of which were being sent across the sea. There was no authority to move the Army with fixed bayonets into an industrial plant, but after the deed was done Congress was asked to pass a 'seizure bill,' and in the Senate it was intimated that we were not backing up our President when we wrote in an amendment which merely required that the management and labor be given ample time to conduct negotiations before the Army was used to seize the plant. But it was to keep us out of war.

(11) Then we find suddenly that our troops are in Iceland – outside of the Western Hemisphere. Although we were told we were to take over Iceland and protect its people, we find that our soldiers are participating with the British troops there – outside the Western Hemisphere. They say again it is for national defense and to keep us out of war.

Then we find that boys who were drafted from their homes, from their work, under the promise in the law for only 1 year's service have been sent, some of them, to the bases where those in authority knew at the time they were sending them that they could not keep faith with these boys and return them within the year.

(12) Then they came to Congress again and asked for authority for things that had already been done. What authority did they ask for? To remove the restrictions of the law so that men could be sent anywhere the Commander in Chief wished to send them beyond the Western Hemisphere. And, more – they asked to have every restriction removed as to the number that could be drafted, and they asked to have the restriction also removed as to the limit of time of their service."

Then came an ultimatum first to Germany, and afterwards to Japan. After the ultimatums came the "shoot on sight" order, followed by the news that "the shooting has started." That was the end Roosevelt had in view all the while he was guaranteeing his leadership as a course calculated to keep us out of war. The criticism he deserves is not that he misled his country but that he deliberately and deceitfully misled it. As one of his political critics said, *"He lied us into war because he did not have the courage to lead us into war."*

To find out how much Roosevelt was but the tool of the international bankers in these steps, "short of war," one had but to consider the forces behind a few of them. Take the Conscription Act first. It is hoped that a more detailed account of this step, as well as the others, will soon get a specific treatment and thus furnish still more light on the intrigues and power of the international bankers.

The conscription drive was started at the Harvard Club in New York City. Present was Mr. Grenville Clark of the law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner and Ballantine. It was he, according to Senator Holt, who actually wrote the original conscription bill. According to an Associated Press dispatch of July 1, 1937, Mrs. Grenville Clark saved \$90,000 in taxes in one year through the use of 16 trusts. The Clark's trusts were established by Mr. and Mrs. Clark and were operated so that during the 1936 tax year each of their three children was the beneficiary of five separate trusts.

That was the man who wrote the Conscription Bill—a man who refused to have his dollars conscripted but was anxious to have the sons of America conscripted to save his dollars. As Senator Holt remarked, it is "Communism" when one tries to conscript dollars, but it is "holy democracy" when one conscripts cannon fodder to save dollars.

Robert P. Patterson who was then the assistant Secretary of War was there, as was Elihu Root, Jr.—a member of the Clark law firm. Then there was Julius Ochs Adler, general manager of the New York Times, the pro-British ... bible of journalism. Mr. Adler, according to Senator Holt, is a man who holds stock in corporations in countries then at war. Did he want to protect his investments?

Then there was Mr. K. P. Budd—a director of the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co., with headquarters in London. Add the name of Mr. J. B. Taylor, Jr., which the Congressional Record links up with those who have money invested in aircraft and aviation corporations. Also present was Mr. F. M. Weld, a director of the Baldwin Locomotive Works which will make millions out of this impending war. Brig. Gen. Benedict Crowell was there. He was the Assistant Secretary of War and Director of Munitions during the World War.

These men met on the 22nd day of May and set in motion this drive for conscripting the youth of the nation. There were no farmers present. There were no laborers present. There were no mothers present. There were no peace-loving Americans present. Present only were

the scions of wealth, the directors of propaganda and the hard-boiled minions of Mars all except one of whom, according to Senator Holt, represented international banking firms.

On the 23rd day of May they went back to the same club and passed a resolution for "aid to the Allies short of war." On the 3rd day of June they met again. They met to raise money. They met to raise a quarter of a million dollars, according to Senator Holt (who puts his assertion in the form of a question) to drive a conscription bill through the Congress of the United States. One quarter of a million dollars to pay for propaganda. One quarter of a million dollars to conscript the boys of America. And that is patriotism!

About the time Senator Holt made this story known, the facts on the "Destroyer Deal" leaked out.

The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs asked Lewis Compton, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, to appear before the Committee and submit to questioning. Mr. Compton was asked by what authority this fleet of American warships was handed over to Great Britain. He was asked by what logic this fleet could be called a "surplus" fleet, or an obsolete fleet even when it was in the process of being built. Knowing that the cat was out of the bag, he admitted that the fleet was not obsolete but that the Navy Department "*could change its mind.*"

The chairman of the Committee then asked if Mr. Compton made this transfer by his own authority. The Under-Secretary of the Navy said it had been done entirely on his own responsibility. Immediately news of this admission got into the President's ears. To save the situation from further embarrassing disclosures, Mr. Roosevelt contradicted Mr. Compton, saying that he, the President of the United States, had been fully and directly responsible for the transfer.

The law covering this point was read in the House of Representatives by Mr. Case of South Dakota. It is found in Chapter 30, Title V, 3, 40 Stat. 222. It is a law which has been in effect since 1917. It reads thus:

"It is unlawful during a war in which the United States is a neutral nation to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed or equipped as a vessel of war ... with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation."

And the law goes on to say that if it is broken, the breaker shall suffer a fine or imprisonment or both. There stood Mr. Roosevelt once more displaying his disregard for law in the spotlight which he himself had created.

And if these vessels were obsolete as Lewis Compton tried to say they were, let us remember that they were built and constructed under President Roosevelt. Perhaps that admission is even more significant when one arrives at the conclusion that the ships which he built were not efficient when constructed to compete with better grade ships. That is the

man into whose hands the United States entrusted the building of a two-sea navy. One wondered by the force of logic that if after the two-sea navy would have been built, the Secretary of the Navy would be forced to admit it was an obsolete, inefficient hunk of junk.

A pro-New Deal source reported soon after American troops invaded Germany east of the Rhine in World War II, that one H. J. Caesar, alien property custodian in France during the German occupation, had been captured by American forces and that proof was found among his captured papers, that United States and British Branch banks in Paris aided the enemy by loaning money to the Germans after the fall of France and while the United States was at war with Germany. If these charges are true as to American banks (Morgan and Chase National branch banks were specifically mentioned) then these bankers it would seem, are clearly guilty of treason by aiding the enemy with loans during the war.

The intrigue of international finance usually follows a pretty familiar pattern; if not the treasonable fashion pursued in the accusation just referred to, then often in the manner used by the Rothschilds as far back as 1815.

A group of international money lenders desired to make a World War financial cleanup similar to that of old Nathan Rothschild at the battle of Waterloo Brother Nathan, historians say, spread false news; depressed the market on bonds and bought in at low, distress prices, only to have his holdings increase a hundredfold when the delayed real news came in.

The World War I group knew that, owing to the speed of communications (even though they controlled them), an important battle would not serve their purposes, so they bought heavily and waited.

When the naval battle of Skagerrak had been fought, the news came first to Winston Churchill as First Lord of the Admiralty. The news was carefully suppressed while a report which did not agree with the facts was sent to the British Prime Minister David Balfour to be read in Parliament. For five days the facts were suppressed through the co-operation of Churchill at the Admiralty.

The plan worked. Those five days were marked by the wildest rumors about mounting casualty lists and the defeat of the British fleet was painted far worse than the facts warranted. The inner circle of financiers made millions; but their deliberately engineered crash in English securities brought ruin to scores of old English titled families. These English aristocrats did not know why—but the bottom simply fell out of their security investments and “the war” was blamed.

It must be remembered that this group of manipulators did not represent English interests, although they hid, and are still operating, behind the protection of the Union Jack. The ... Deutsche Bank in Germany, and several American banking houses, were part and parcel of the syndicate that reaped the windfall from the battle of Skagerrak.

Of course, Mr. Winston Churchill—that hypersensitive character who collected a huge sum from an American publisher for publishing a single erroneous statement about him after he called America that dastardly, more slanderous name, “Uncle Shylock.” with complete immunity—being the key man in springing this deal, did not, we may be sure, perform without compensation. All in all. it was a sordid piece of business, this profiteering handsomely while several thousand courageous German and English sailors died in a steel hail of exploding shells and went to their end in watery graves.

It is not difficult to understand why Winston Churchill, Goat of Gallipoli and Duke of Dunkirk, received such a magnificent press.

The international money lenders control many channels of publicity. Other unsavory characters of unsavory plots had to be built up. Take the case of Maxim Litvinov deposed as Foreign Commissar of Soviet Russia. In how many newspapers was it read that he was responsible for killing more than 30 persons at Tiflis and injuring more than 200 in a bank robbery, or that he was a “notorious smuggler” or that he was a spy, or that he was twice ordered out of England for seditious and traitorous activities? Why should all this be unprintable and why should such a character be built up in the world press with nations, prime ministers—yes, even presidents—hanging on his words, and doing his bidding? Who builds up such characters if not the war mongers’ press?

Secretary of State Byrnes was supposed to be the outstanding American on the true causes of the war. Yet he displayed the most startling ignorance regarding this fundamental aspect and showed himself steeped in war propaganda when he said in Paris while attending the “Peace” Conference that the two World Wars in this century were due to German military might. And to think Byrnes was chosen as the “man of 1946!” British Foreign Secretary Bevin reiterated the same thought when he said that the chief aim of the deputy foreign ministers was to throttle the Reich for hundreds of years by crushing the German lust for power.

When the history of the late war propaganda is written it will be found that when conscription was first passed in England it was really for the purpose of internal control rather than aimed at the German Reich where the English had tremendous investments. It will reveal that in the war that followed the Battle of Singapore, for example, was in effect a battle for Kuhn, Loeb and Company of America, with their rubber monopoly, and the Sasoons of Britain, with their opium monopoly. Americans were fed propaganda for so long that it was a shock for them to learn that roughly four out of every five American G. I’s preferred their enemy Germany to any of the Allied countries they saw. When the history of World War II propaganda is written other information still more shocking will be told. It will also be found that the financiers were propagating it.

The mass of evidence concerning the people and principles responsible for World War II is so vast that the author of “Citadels of Chaos” hopes it will be put into a volume of its

own. Such a manuscript should be prepared now while the evidence is still fresh in order that it might be of untold service in molding true American patriotism as well as profitable to future true historians in their battle with propaganda.

When the startling information concerning International Bankers' stake in the war is known people will not find it difficult to believe that if Hitler had agreed to take a loan of one billion dollars from the Bank of England on any day from the invasion of Poland to the German capitulation, the war would have been over by evening of the next day.

The tense Berlin situation of the present has put World War III in a more or less cold stage. The basic difference between Russia and American internationalists is over whose money, Russia's or America's, shall be used in the Berlin area. The blood and fortunes of Americans are definitely in danger of being used once again to enforce the un-Constitutional and anti-American practice of our unlawfully legalized counterfeiters.

When people learn the facts they will say with the brilliant Indian lecturer, C. Jinarajadana:

"I do not believe we shall finally disarm War till we have a reform of the banking system of the world. International Finance is the one element which contributed to War."

Chapter IX

War Pays Off

"It now appears, from the facts that are already available to the whole world, that we have fought the most diabolic war in history at the cost of unmeasured sacrifice only to find that our greatest enemy and the gravest threats to the honor, the integrity, and the continued existence of our free institutions, have moved right into our midst.

This repudiation, not only of the Potsdam Declaration, but also of every law of God and man, has been deliberately engineered with such malevolent cunning, and with such diabolic skill, that The American people, themselves, have been caught in an international death trap."

Such is the well substantiated charge of Senator Capehart speaking in the greatest legislative body in the world, the United States Senate. The dealers of death, the international bankers, have collected their billions and will collect yet more from interest on the staggering debts they forced upon the various countries of the world. It would be natural to suppose that with the elimination of their two foremost competitors, Germany and Japan, these creatures would be content to close the highly profitable deal which finds them the only ones who gained anything out of all this bloodletting and international carnage. Blood-letting, it will be remembered, was the old method of curing all ills — the method of International bankers who so frequently seek to cure their ills in the blood-letting of war dates back to the same era.

But now as a Colossus of Credit these forces who are identified as those who caused the war and the ones who profited out of it, are working just as diabolically to simplify their control over world governments. This is being done by concentrating these nations into one single body, the United Nations Organization with the World Bank to finance it. Of course, it must be presented under an attractive cover; and just after war, nothing could be more attractive than permanent peace. So that is the cover, while behind it is clearly discernible fact that there is no real attempt to establish peace and for that reason no peace solution has yet reached as far as the "scrap of paper" stage.

The words of Senator Capehart seem to come back like a refrain:

"This repudiation, not only of the Potsdam Declaration, but also of every law of God and man, has been deliberately engineered with such malevolent cunning, and with such diabolic skill, that the American people, themselves, have been caught in an international death trap."

History is already establishing the wisdom of Representative Sumner, who said in the House of Representatives:

"Our Government's peace program is no peace program. The movement for it is led by the same old warmongers, still masquerading as princes of peace, who involved us in war while pretending their purpose was to keep us out of war. Like lend-lease and other bills which involved us in war while promising to keep us out of war, this measure (United Nations Organization) will involve us in every war here after. You know that there are going to be plenty of wars hereafter if you look at some of the small nations which, thanks to American aid and influence, are being enslaved: Indonesia, Persia, Korea, Burma, Turkey, Poland, the Baltics, and the Balkans. History shows that the people in these countries prefer death to slavery. The American people also always prefer death to slavery to foreign governments.

You know, of course, that this measure gives congressional authority for surrendering the American people to an all-powerful world super government which will be controlled by imperialistic foreign governments, England and Russia. Advocates insist that it is not going to be a world superstate but what else could you call it? It is so coordinated with other world organizations, including the Bretton Woods organization, controlling all the money in the world, that it can and will reduce the American people to the same level of servitude now endured by millions in downtrodden imperialistic empires."

The American government was built into an organization almost synonymous with freedom as long as it was small enough for the people to have a hand in its operation and conduct. In this world superstate. The American people will have no part in the operation of this tool of financial racketeers and their political puppets. Other nations of the world will have no voice in the government. It is clearly an instrument of slavery at the hands of the few monsters who have directed the course of late world affairs. Jefferson was eternally right when he warned that the danger most likely to destroy the American nation would be certain selfish interests who would form factions of American citizens putting the policies of some foreign government ahead of their own United States.

Some of the blackest deeds of the American past will fade into insignificance compared with the common policy of a world government under the direction of its present rulers. For example, when the American marines were sent into Nicaragua some twenty years ago, the people were told they were going to see that an honest election was held there. While Americans were wondering why they were not sent into Chicago or Philadelphia if such were the case, the facts gradually leaked out and showed that the Marines

were in reality sent to collect the debts owed to a couple of big banks in New York City which had lent money to the Nicaraguan government. With big bankers running the world super government will anyone dare hope that such would be anything but common practice? Representative Sumner continues:

"That the decrees of this world super government will be illegal and unjust to Americans, we already know from sad experience. And what good will the American veto power do us? Look at how the American representative on UNNRA, Mr. Clayton, contrived to put through a motion giving Russia \$250-million to which Russia was not legally entitled. Russia and England, the imperialistic governments controlling this super government, have managed to pick American pockets all through the war we fought to save them. And what have Americans got out of this war? Nothing but Communism and corpses and this new eunuch world plunderbund, which is already despised even before it sets up its splendiferous new offices in Hollywood, or some less appropriate city."

The underlying purposes of this One-World set-up brought on by the late banker-controlled war are:

1. To destroy the Republic of the United States and overthrow free enterprise, setting up instead a super world State based on a world money economy and dominated by the Money Power.
2. To spread lies, smears and intellectual confusion through the control of government, press, radio, schools, churches, movies and every channel of public information.
3. To take over industry, business and agriculture in a continuous planned emergency, with the money power directing the fixing of prices and wages.
4. To cultivate intense dependence on the Money Power State largely by keeping the citizens alert for hand-outs and passing blame for unsatisfactory conditions on a new version of "isolationists, reactionaries, fascists, etc."
5. To increase debts to the Money Power until the money power owns everything.
6. To make not only a few nations, but the whole world feeble subjects of the Money Power by the creation of a World Bank as a creative nucleus of the world superstate.
7. To completely destroy every vestige of nationalism and patriotism for the old Washington-Jefferson ideals of Americanism.

A few stalwart, patriotic Americans could see through all this and take courage to defy all these great and varied forms of opposition. For example, Representative Smith, of Ohio, on the floor of the House in speaking against the UN proposal said:

"Mr. Chairman, the future historian, when he comes to consider the action of the Congress which is about to be completed, may well pause and wonder I venture that he will regard this action as one of the most stupid and ruinous any nation ever undertook.

If the Public really understood the meaning of this grandiose scheme to establish a United Nations Organization and to make the United States a member of it, it would never be approved by the Congress; indeed it would never have been proposed in the first instance.

A vote for this measure is a vote for permanently underwriting with the sweat and toil of our people the economies of the other so-called member nations of this Organization. Further, it is a vote for guaranteeing with the blood of our sons and daughters the preservation of British imperialism. The nucleus of this international Organization is a military alliance between the United States and Great Britain, the rest being mainly window dressing....

This measure strikes at the very heart of the Constitution."

No one could be a good American and at the same time oppose co-operation with other nations for the attainment of peace or any other beneficial end. Popular belief to the contrary, American tradition is steeped in efforts of international co-operation.

The United States originated many of the world's organizations which have been of permanent duration. Her record as an international "joiner" and participant in world congresses and conferences is unequalled by any other country. Because America refused to join the League of Nations her reputation as "isolationist" is undeserved. In fact, while the League debated and jockeyed over power politics, the United States worked for world peace with the Washington Naval limitations agreement, the Nine Power treaty, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and three disarmament conferences, before she was finally deserted by the dying League when Secretary of State Stimson opposed Japan's aggression in Manchuria.

The United States participated in 351 international congresses or conventions during a five year period, took part in 32 world expositions, was a member of 29 permanent commissions or international organizations and of 22 permanent international bodies where our Government was represented by civilian members. Many of these were represented by more than 51 nations, approximately the number now associated with United Nations.

The international congresses discussed 137 different subjects, almost the gamut of human activities. Many were lively shows as well as world shaking in importance.

Americans devoutly want peace and co-operation with other nations but when that ideal becomes a mask for a sell-out to a lying group of dastardly international cut-

throats, Americanism must object. Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and San Francisco are sheeps clothing cloaking concentration which makes the takeover easier. If all the power for war or peace is in one source, only one source has to be taken over to have all this authority. The best that can be said of UN is that it was an experiment in the laboratory of idealism which blew up in the test-tube.

The McBride Report aptly says:

"What is happening in this country is not the accidental result of the impractical plans of idealistic do-gooders, but a well-organized and well-financed national and international conspiracy to loot the United States and take over control of our Government. A thorough investigation by appropriate committees of the Congress will show that such a conspiracy has long existed, yet those courageous and patriotic Members of Congress who, in the past, have dared to point out these dangers, have been jeered at, sneered at, ridiculed with cries of 'red baiting' and 'fascist' and subjected to a barrage of abuse by so-called liberals who are liberal only with other people's money. Sneers, jeers, and ridicule became a fine art through their use by the Intellectuals and Fellow-Travelers in the press, on the radio, and wherever people listen to them. In their most condescending and patronizing manner they smilingly and smirkingly referred to patriots who were pointing out these dangers to our Country as 'alarmists' who were seeing bogies under their beds. All this was done to provide a smoke screen and lull America to sleep while the conspirators carried out their traitorous plans."

International Bankers, those princes of pride and purse, care nothing for the particular brand of governmental philosophy. They finance fascism, communism, socialism, monarchies and democracies. True to the founder's words the International Bankers care not who make the laws of the nations as long as they are permitted to issue and regulate the money. No one noticed a change in British-U.S. relations since Britain went Socialistic. Hitler was not an especially bad sort of a fellow until he kicked the big Bankers out of Germany. Joe Stalin was Pal Joey as long as there was a possibility that he would seek a loan of several billion dollars.

These international bankers are in reality first cousins to international Communists. The British member of the British Economic Mission to Russia was Mr. Lawrence Cadbury, a representative of the Bank of England. The American member was the pro-British Mr. Harry Hopkins, administrator for that bankers' implement, the lend-lease fund. The presence in Moscow of these spokesmen for international banking is significant.

During the war Thomas Lamont appeared on the platform at various pro-Russian rallies, some of which were conducted by American Communists. His presence at such meetings was regarded as a demonstration of Wall Street and Union Square solidarity.

In this period Wall street persuaded itself that Russia might become a broad field for capital investment and would at least be a heavy consumer of capital goods after the war.

Considerable credence was given to the Earl Browder line that capitalism and communism could work together. The former Communist party leader's statements were regarded as expressing a Kremlin need for foreign capital to develop Russia after the war. Such men of wealth as Willkie and Joseph Davies, former ambassador to Russia and wedded to the Post breakfast food millions, were calling on business to co-operate with the soviets in the expectation of creating a new field for capital investment.

The about face of the administration from the soft to the hard policy against Russia is traced by observers to the realization of Wall street that Russia will never be a field for capital development. In fact, Wall street now regards Russia as a dangerous enemy because she may seize the middle east and its rich oil deposits.

This fear was one of the reasons that dictated the administration policy on Greece and Turkey. The British have persuaded this administration to call for huge loans to that area. The British financial interests convinced Wall street that the American government should act in order to protect "American" financial interest. Of course, the British were not concerned when Russia took over Poland because Poland does not sit on her life line through the Suez Canal while Greece and Turkey do.

Following the lead of Lamont, a host of lesser Wall street figures threw their lot with the New Deal to promote their financial interests or to play with power. Such influences are still felt in the government from within and without. Wall streeters are running the government from the inside and outside.

Because Wall streeters are traditionally pro-British (their Federal Reserve banking system being merely a branch of an International system with the Bank of England as another branch) the New York interests are for international, not American, interests taking their cue from British internationalists.

Corliss Lamont, son of Thomas Lamont, partner and president of J. P. Morgan and Co., has been an active Communist sympathizer for years. He has written many atheistic words in behalf of the Soviet system. In 1935, the Naval Intelligence Bureau listed him as a "fringe revolutionist" and described such agitators as those who are *"too lacking in intestinal fortitude to go all the way with Communism, but stand by and urge the Communist to do his worst and provide him with protection, sympathy and defense, while he commits the overt act they have not had the courage to commit themselves."*

In "Who's Who," young Lamont lists many of his pro-Soviet works and activities. He became popular with some of his father's friends after Russia entered the war. Young Lamont's latest sally is conducted as chairmanship for a drive for \$25,000 for "Soviet Russia Today." His own donation is said to be "generous."

The Rockefeller families keep the Fellow Travelers around Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary. The Morgan millions help Henry Wallace's friends and Marshall Field's wealth is notorious for the financing of a red-complected press. "*Nationalization! I welcome it!*" said Montague Norman, once Governor of the Bank of England. Bankers and Socialists flocked together to destroy private, free enterprise.

Those who persist in finding a Capital Communist tie-up difficult to comprehend need only to distinguish between Communism in theory and Communism in practice. Actually, Communism in practice becomes State Socialism which is the same result attained in a Money Government. Both are based on the same materialistic philosophy.

Such a course of policy is useful in advancing money and other aid to help Russia on one hand and in building up the British Empire interests as a check against Russia on the other hand. To say we need anyone's defense against Russia is pure nonsense in view of American incomparable superiority in every significant military category and industrial potentiality. The danger from Russian Communism is from within our own borders, not from Russian arms. Russia will never open war on America until her Communists and American fellow travelers disrupt transportation and production by strikes, sabotage our arms, undermine our armed forces, render our governmental agencies ineffective, and otherwise make America internally weak.

The banker-communist tie-up is horrified to think that the United States has a monopoly on the atomic bomb. And just why shouldn't the atom bomb be an American monopoly? America paid for the research on the bomb. It was made in America at American factories by Americans. America supplied all the essential materials. It was directed principally by Americans as outlined chiefly by American scientists. America is the only country to employ it and the only country that is capable of doing so.

The bankers and internationalists are anxious to give the atom bomb away because it blasted every excuse they could offer for destruction of American sovereignty with American submission to their treasonous plan for world government, and because it made America so mighty that these treacherous interventionists can no longer say America is too weak to defend herself without the aid of Russia and England.

The present plan for atomic control smells of a treasonable attempt to give the most superior and revolutionary weapon to potential enemies. Bernard Baruch, international banker, maker of presidents and presidential policies, conducted negotiations for "adequate safeguards" as an excuse for what has been described as "*a long series of futile negotiations to*

give the bomb to the world." Baruch was representing the entire United States although he was never elected to an office as high as dog catcher in his long and meddling career. Before an unconstitutional organization he conducted an unconstitutional committee for an unconstitutional purpose in negotiations he had no authority to conduct in the first place.

It is believed that Russia has dishonorably acquired most of the essential information on the bomb but doesn't even know what to do with it now that she has it. At Teheran, Russia and the United States agreed to swap military secrets and information. Russia gave us their information on the Katyusha six-rocket gun, and we used it against Germany. Perhaps under this treaty, we have given them the atom bomb. Anyway our Chairman of the Board entrusted to keep the secret was a Russian sympathizer.

The present proposal for "control" says that by giving the atom bomb up and its secret away gives America security from the bomb. That is more foolishness. America has the bomb; other nations do not. American scientists have with actual demonstration every perfected detail; other nations do not. America has the factories and materials; other nations do not. On this point the Chicago Tribune rightly says:

"Are we likely to be safer from atomic bomb attack under those circumstances than we are now with the only stock of atom bombs in the world and unique experience in making them? As matters stand, what nation would dare challenge us to an atomic war with all this accumulated advantage on our side? Can we feel more secure when our advantage is gone? Would we feel more secure if every other nation knew as much as we do about building planes and flying them or if our navy were no stronger than any other? Then what reason is there to think that giving away the atom bomb will protect us more effectively than keeping it?"

We have made the offer, however, only to have it meet with criticism and skepticism, notably from Russia, whose Marxian scriptures call for the destruction of the American republic and whose custom it is to break treaties. The expectation plainly is that further concessions can be wrung from us. Mr. Baruch still is trying to find an acceptable formula for giving away the bomb. He has gone much too far already."

Anyone acquainted with the pitiful yet laughable inferiority of Russia's scientific status knows the only way they could ever get the bomb is to kidnap enough German scientists to make it for them, as they are trying to do, or to buy or steal it as they are known to be attempting to do with extremely heavy pressure, lies, deceits, spies and agents. What is more tragic, certain internationalists want them to succeed: They do everything contrary to the best interests of America.

It is not surprising that these same buzzards of the banking business engineered the San Francisco Charter which is but a carbon copy of other travesties on justice. For example, every weakness of the famous Kellogg Peace Pact is apparent in UN. Here are the mutual defects:

1. Obvious loopholes for crafty diplomats.
2. No provisions for rectifying the injustices in post-war treaties.
3. Failure to renounce the real causes of war.
4. Ignoring the realities of European and other continental conditions.
5. Preparing of peace without even including the really peaceful nations – those who remained neutral.
6. Absence of good will without which peace talks a farce.

UN has one singular defect to distinguish it, namely the Veto. The nations themselves now admit this is the outstanding contribution to failure. Those who predicted this result at the time of the Veto adoption were called “obstructionists,” “perfectionists” and worse, when they were merely pointing out the obvious.

In 1921 Robert Lansing, Secretary of State in the Cabinet of Woodrow Wilson, one of the most ardent erstwhile supporters of the League of Nations, wrote of the League in the book “The Peace Negotiations.” Read the following comments and note how perfectly the words “United Nations” fit in when substituted for “The League,”

“The League . . . is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the Great Powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.

It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the might to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the Treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed people are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They

have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the Quintuple Alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests of their own.

It is true that to please the aroused public opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo ...But whatever it may be called, or however it may be disguised, it is an alliance of the Five Great Military Powers.

It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of 'The Five' is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is Primary.

The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue; and the law of unanimity in the Council, which may offer a restraint, will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust.

We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest."

Tom Watson knew the real purpose of the League of Nations. In his address on the League of Nations he said:

"In the league, the great charter is engulfed, the sovereignty of the people disappears, and a universal monarchy is established.

The council of the league will absorb within itself judicial power, legislative power, and executive power (which World Government through Bretton Woods and the World Bank has already done)....

It pretends to assimilate the yellow race, the brown race, the black race, and the white race.

It pretends to harmonize democracy with imperialism, the kings with the republics.

It pretends to reconcile the Buddhists with the Confucionists, the Moham-medan with the Christian.

It pretends to make a seamless garment out of 33 Variegated pieces.

It pretends to expect international melody out of 33 discordant national notes.

If it's real purpose is to put an end to just such disorder as the American colonists created, and the French created, and the South Americans created, when they broke the yoke of tyrannical kings, then the league will be a success.

If the real purpose is to create an international guaranty and collection agency for the great bankers and bondholders of indebted nations, then the league will be a success.

If the real purpose is to permanently fasten the yoke of the conquerors upon Egypt, Asia Minor, Africa, India, Oceania, and the greater part of China, then the league will be a success."

These frank commentaries on the League of Nations are equally applicable to UN because the United Nations Organization had the same aims and the same forces as authors. These same powers and their One World-Union Now sycophants, some of whom were decorated by foreign governments which constitutes recognition that they served another country better than their own, support any and every degrading American submission to the selfish whim of foreign debt-welshing ingrates, fight defenders of American sovereignty, ignore the simplest facts of history and the most evident every-day realities.

The treaties between the imperialistic powers that they will not push their political philosophies and power into each other's territory are about the most unrealistic things that could be imagined. Certainly Americans' own imperialistic one-worlders base all their thinking on the idea of sticking their noses into other people's business. This is why they are always wandering around in the old world instead of promoting a little pan-Americanism and American virtues of freedom.

At present the only free speech allowed anywhere in the old world is that which belittles the United States and her contributions in the war. In Italy Britain is broadcasting propaganda unjustly derogatory to America and erroneously flattering to herself at American expense! American contributions to the war effort were more than the rest of the world together for the following brief reasons:

America spent more money to fight the war against Germany, Italy, and Japan than Russia and the British Empire combined. America's army and navy were the major force in the victory in Europe and almost the sole force in defeating Japan. America's armies in Europe captured more German prisoners than the Russians, British, and French together. America's war production was greater than the combined British and Russian output. America equipped not only her own forces, but those of her allies. Lend-lease to the United Kingdom equaled one-third of that nation's own war expenditures. The Russian army

could not have moved without our automotive equipment, to which we added billions of dollars' worth of guns, tanks and planes. The French (after 1942) and the Chinese got all their modern weapons from us. America mobilized more men, out of a population of 140 million, than the British empire did from a population about four times as great.

Thus America gets "hooked" in innumerable ways for financing the personal selfish, dictatorial interests of Britain's real rulers and most of the ways are never breathed to the generous American taxpayer. The cover must be torn from this shameful saga of treachery in a detailed work before too long! Contrast giving Britain \$4-billion with loopholes which leave not a single string attached to what happens when Britain loans. Several examples could be cited, but take Newfoundland for instance.

Newfoundland went broke in 1933. In return for aid from the British government it yielded its dominion status and was ruled by a commission and governor appointed in London. War prosperity, including large American expenditures on bases has bailed out the Newfoundlanders. The British government now has to plead its own insolvency to get a loan from the United States. When the British bail out another country, even one in their own family of nations, they require the bankrupts to submit to government from London. No such stipulation has been attached to the proposed American loan. Naturally, there is no disposition in this country actually to govern Britain, but while getting the loan the British have made no commitment to reform even financial policies inimitable to the United States. They have not even made the frank disclosure of their assets that any ordinary bankrupt is required to make in their country and ours Britain as a borrower is a far different customer than Britain as a lender.

Thus Senator Langer could say on the floor of the United States Senate:

"I believe from the information given me, that several hundred persons, many of whom are British subjects, others of whom have only taken out their first naturalization papers, and others deliberately planted here by foreign governments, are holding key positions in agencies controlling American foreign affairs, and that many of them are furthering British aims at American expense. I realize the seriousness of these charges, and would not make them unless I were satisfied that they are true."

Under the direction of international finance, the American policy toward another of the great "democracies"—Russia—is even more amazing. Referring to such nations as "democracies" truly makes the designation a word of knaves and fools, as has well been said: Of knaves who use it for ulterior purposes, or fools who believe it. Senator Holt said during the war:

"What is the difference between the dictatorship of Germany and the dictatorship of Russia in world conditions today? Just two things: First, Germany is

fighting England. Russia is not. What else is happening? Germany is a factor against England in world trade. Russia is not. Those are the two answers to why a difference and distinction is drawn by the administration between Russia and Germany—first, because Germany is fighting England; second, because Germany is becoming a factor in competition for world trade.”

There is less democracy in Russia than there is in Sing-Sing, for in American prisons there is at least freedom of religion and the hope of release and something better. Yet for a brief and accurate look at the American-banker policy toward Russia one could scarcely do better than ponder the words of Representative O’Kanski in a speech, “What Every American Should Know.” He says:

“These international do-gooders will embrace anything and everything to keep going. Recently we have seen this crowd embrace and court the Communists. Because they love communism? Don’t be silly. Communists do not like profiteers. But Communist Russia today is the most fertile field for international do-gooders and the Communists have fallen in love, and what a courtship it is.

The Communists see in this a chance to weaken America and strengthen Communist Russia so they are accepting the courtship. No longer do the Communists denounce profits and big business. They are sweethearts now. As long as anyone makes a profit feeding Communist Russia it is O.K. with the Communists. So get ready, U.S.A., because what you have seen is only a sample. Get ready to dish out because now you are to be taken to the cleaners for good....

We gave Russia (among many other things) 14,000 airplanes. Yet, whoever heard of Russia bombing anything except Finland. American airplanes and flyers had to do the job in the rest of Europe, Africa, and Asia. Our own boys had to wait until Stalin’s appetite was satisfied. In return for lend-lease, it should be pointed out that every country we helped gave us something in return—except Russia. We cannot even get one little base from her to help us fight the Jap[anese]” . . . (Nor even a promise to discuss lend-lease settlement.)

Our international do-gooders now have the following plans to help Russia: Lend-lease \$22 Billion; three billion a year to Russia. UNRRA, \$2-Billion; half of it to Russia or satellites. Bretton Woods \$8-Billion; three billions to Russia. Commodity Credit, \$2-Billion; one-half to Russia. Export-Import Bank, \$2-Billion; on-half to Russia. Besides this, the international do-

gooders are planning a \$10 Billion loan to Russia. And besides that, the same givers want to wipe out the three billion Russia owes us from the last war. The combined total that these schemers want to give Russia in the next 5 years is about \$20,000,000,000 of hard-earned American money.

The U.S.A. built Hitler's war machine with U.S.A. money. The U.S.A. built Japan's war machine with U.S.A. money. The U.S.A. is now building Russia's war machine with U.S.A. money. The U.S.A. makes its own wars—bigger and better as the years flee by."

The splendid little paper "Money" rightly sized up UN under a heading, "You Know UNO":

"When you know UNO you will see where it leads to total slavery, and you will not like the prospect.

UNO is a Preface or Preparation for what is to follow, which is the Supreme World State. When that arrives UNO will fade out, you know, for it will have finished its work, which is to fool the people of the world to take the first steps into total slavery.

The World Bank, you know, as well as UNO, are governments from without, both contrary to the concepts of so-called "democracy." Members will be appointed, not elected by the people.

When the World Bank gets strong enough to dominate the World State UNO, you know, will fade out and the World State will be ruled by appointees of the World Bank, under cover you know. That will be after World War III. Then the screws will be turned tighter onto everybody under the World State and the World Bank."

The New York Times, always a fan for internationalism, in an editorial entitled "UN AT WORK," speaks with general satisfaction of all activities. It says of UN's Economic and Social Council that:

"It's real work will doubtless be done through its commissions, of which ten will meet here within the next few weeks. Housing, foreign investments, 'full employment, child welfare, crime, health, education, trade, living standards and human rights all come under the Economic and Social Council's wing, either directly or by co-operation with other agencies. Literally, there is nothing human that the Council would find alien."

The Times apparently is fully satisfied with this effort to run everything in the world by international edict for the benefit of the directing financiers. For that is precisely what this preposterously all-embracing scheme means.

Politically the gang in control is an international New Deal gang. It is closely related to international Communism, just as are many of the leading New Dealers in the United States. Only the situation in the international picture is worse. For while our national New Dealers almost without exception say they abhor Communism—even though the things they work for make up a large part of the complete Communist picture—so in the international New Deal a large part of the personnel are either friendly to Communism, and many of them are outright Communists. From evidence becoming available it is not too much to say that the ideologies, training, and education of nearly all the leading figures in the various subdivisions of UN stem straight from Moscow.

In the International Trade Organization, one of the United Nations' subdivisions, the United States although it produces the greatest volume of world trade, will have but a single vote. Other nations voting according to their national interests, will decide all questions of foreign trade of the United States. By a stroke of the pen of this international body the people can be told what they can buy, and where, and at what price; what to sow and when to reap; what they must make or refrain from making.

The National Economic Council in one of its semi. weekly letters calls this point to its readers attention. Through the International Trade Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labor Organization, the International Refugee Organization, the International Bank and Fund, and all the other international New Deal outfits, all international relations will be regulated. Because the United States has but one vote in these alien bodies, they will be regulated in the interests of others than the United States. This great nation will have handed to others of alien philosophy and concepts the keys to her strong boxes, her homes, her economy, her security. The United States will have given to others the power to revise her customs, her laws, even the Constitution and the whole American way of life.

No one argues with the announced purpose of the United Nations Organization “to *preserve peace and advance human progress.*” But it will not and cannot do either. Peace will not be preserved until the causes of war are removed. The Charter falsely accuses Germany and Japan as being sole causes of the war and proposes to disarm and keep these countries down as the means of preventing war. In the last hundred years France and England have been in five times as many wars as Germany and Japan combined. The charter is designed to punish one group of nations selected in advance, allegedly because of their war record which is insignificant in comparison with the self-appointed all-just unanimously chosen exemplars of peace. If the barest rudiments of justice existed the nations would oppose Rus-

sian domination of three-fourths of Europe with at least as much vehemence as they condemn Germany for domination of the city of Danzig—which city rightly belonged to her.

Imperialism and balance of power under the direction of International Finance were the causes of wars for the last century and a half. These the United Nations Charter dare not even mention, much less discuss and act upon. Complete control of the organization is in the hands of the four big nations, three of which are the most persistent and ruthless aggressors the history of the world has ever seen. The real peaceful nations, the neutral countries, are ignored.

Little nations like Iran, Finland or Denmark are not going to cause wars. It's the big nations who do that. Suppose Russia attacked Iran and the tiny victim appealed to UN. Russia as one of the Big Four would veto any attempt to declare her guilty. The only way Russia could be stopped is by violating the very Charter which exists for the purpose of preserving peace in the advancing of human progress.

Senator Shipstead of Minnesota who, except for Senator Langer of North Dakota, was the only man in the Senate to vote against UN said:

"Unless and until Russia formally yields her veto power, there can be nothing settled, nothing agreed to or acted upon in the Security Council or the General Assembly that can possibly permit America to use the United Nations Organization as an instrument for peace.

As it is now constituted, the Security Council remains an instrument of tyranny to maintain and enforce the secret commitments which are turning Europe and Asia into the breeding grounds of the third world war. If the time ever comes when the abolition of the veto power unlocks the present stalemate in the Security Council, America will still be confronted with the sordid secret agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam which formed the foundations of the alleged 'peace' she has agreed to uphold and to enforce . . . On each occasion I stated that I refused to sign a blank check which was to be filled in secret by power politicians at a later date, and redeemed with American blood and treasure.

As it now turns out those blank checks have been filled in at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam with commitments which are a disgrace and an outrage to the Christian conscience and which now even threaten our own security."

Senator Langer rightly criticized UN in a speech at Minneapolis when he pointed out:

"I say that the UN is not a democracy. It is an oligarchy. Five men can regulate the armament of every nation and establish and maintain their

own military and naval staff. Small nations and minority groups are mere pawns in the hands of five men.... Our freedom has been bought too early to be entrusted to the whims of five men who are in no way accountable to the people for their actions.” (This would have been a good place for the Senator to observe that four of these five men with such power over American freedom are foreigners.)

The crux of the matter, as I see it, is that when large powers deal with smaller and weaker powers their desire is only to exploit, not to develop. The UN merely legalizes this exploitation... The UNO is not spreading the gospel of freedom that is our heritage and our strength. The UNO is merely a club in the hands of five Caesars to maintain the status quo and improve the political strength of the big powers. The UNO does not diminish the enmity of Russia and England but merely legalizes it, placing us square in the middle. Force is the frightening dictator and the UNO merely the armor behind which the dictator parades.”

Americans, as great lovers of Democracy, would abhor this instrument to something approximating the proper degree if they knew the manner in which it was enacted. John R. Flynn said in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate:

“As one who has been watching propaganda for a great many years, I take off my hat. You cannot turn on the radio any hour of the day—morning, noon or night—whether you listen to the Metropolitan Opera or to a horse opera, a hill-billy band, a commentator, or a newscaster that you do not hear a plug for this great instrument of peace.

Nobody know what it is all about. Nobody has read it. Nobody knows what is in it. It is the kind of propaganda that Hitler taught the world so effectively—‘Don’t argue with the people. Just put your idea in a slogan or phrase and repeat it a dozen times a day until it is taken for granted.’

This is what you have done. You have brought into existence a military alliance between four great powers, three of them great aggressors, and around that central core of the military alliance you have placed a halo of small nations without any power to do anything, selling it to the world as a great organization of peace.”

It was a propaganda so vicious it would not tolerate any ordinary questions of an open mind. Anyone who tried to look behind the slogans, to reason on obvious defects of the plan, or to offer the mildest objection the manner of its enactment, immediately brought

the worst pressure of the Smear and Suppress troopers into full play. The sincere Senator from Montana, Burton K. Wheeler, complained on the floor of the Senate as follows:

"Today any man who dares to speak his deepest convictions, even in what he conceived to be the highest service of his country not only does not get a hearing, but he is reviled and smeared, his intentions publicly slandered, and his reputation broken on a twisted rack of interventionist lies.... Mr. President, all I have to say to the American people is that if, as our contemporary wolf pack of propagandists is attempting to prove by its yapping, the simple statement of historical facts and American principles and ideals is derisive, destructive, or subversive to American interests, then America as a nation of free peoples is already blindly groping toward her doom."

Then rising to one of the heights of statesmanship for which history will know and revere him, Wheeler said:

"If the lights of reason are extinguished here in America, if we as a nation are to revert to the pagan faith of tyrants that truth cannot and will not triumph in free conflict, the hope for moral leadership among the nations and the peoples of the earth will perish for long years to come. If, in the future, the individual and all the dignity of the human personality and the creative genius of the human mind and spirit is to be compelled to exist only as a means to an end, namely for the state, the world of the future will degenerate into a vast intellectual, moral, and spiritual concentration camp. With such a trend in international affairs an ever growing reality, I cannot help but cry out in protest."

It was then pointed out that in all the hundred and eleven articles in the Charter of the United Nations Organization there is not one single clear specific provision for the protection of the individual human personality of which the society of nations is composed. In spite of the ballyhoo about establishing the "four freedoms" throughout the world, the terrifying fact stands out that there is no bill of rights, no protection for the individual against tyranny.

Lovers of Democracy will object to subjection to the control of appointed, not elected, officials with absolute power answerable to no one. The people have no choice, can give no sanctions, can demand no reasons for any choice of personnel or course of action. The people can give no list of duties, place any restrictions or grant any standard of qualifications.

The adoption of the Charter turns upside down the Constitution of the United States which does not need here or anywhere else a defense or eulogy as the cornerstone of the American nation and the one great bulwark of freedom and Democracy. In Article II section 1, paragraph 8 of the Constitution contains the oath of office as taken by the President of the

United States and under it no President can legally delegate a representative to a world conference; The Constitution provides only for the election of officers—it does not permit the delegation of officers for the purpose of carrying out executive powers.

Article I, Section 9, paragraph 7 of the Constitution provides and makes obligatory the publication of reports or accounts and receipts of public moneys. Yet, in the Charter, America is obligated by the Assembly to pay unknown sums for unknown purposes, which will not be, according to the Charter itself, publically accounted for.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the Constitution prescribes for definite sums of moneys for the raising of a definite armed force. How then can America be legally obligated, as it is in the UN Charter, to indefinite sums of money for an indefinite length of time for an indefinite number of men for helping the armed forces of world government—armed forces which will establish peace even if it takes continual war to have it, and will establish freedom even if forced upon them tyrant-like and conducted on rules laid down by the dictators who forces Democracy upon them.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 9 of the Constitution establishes tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court. Under it no place can be found that permits Congress to establish tribunals or to submit the people to tribunals superior to the Supreme Court, as is done by the enactment of the UN Charter. The fact that this has not been done, directly at least, does not prove such provisions are not there when anyone who can read with his eyes instead of his prejudices can see them in black and white and learn that they are there.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 3 of the Constitution gives to Congress the regulation of commerce of the nation. There is no right by which an unknown, unpredictable, uncongressional group of men, most of which are not even Americans, may exercise power over the trade and commerce of the United States.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution clearly states that the President of the United States is to be the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States. This is completely violated in the direction given to the American forces in the Charter's world police force.

The Charter does not protect the United States. It does not protect the smaller nations. Who does not protect then? Only the financiers who use it as a clearing house for their business supplied by UN's better half, the World Bank. It is inconceivable that anyone would declare publically, much more propagandize it with the expectation that anyone will believe it, that America will face less hazards by sticking her nose in every quarrel over the face of the earth than she would have acting independently.

The world has the Supreme Authority for saying that there can only be "*peace on earth to men of good will*". (The popular version has it "Peace on earth good will toward men," which, besides being scarcely intelligible, is a flagrant mistranslation of *et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis*). However, the Charter is not only absolutely devoid of anything

approaching a moral basis, but is composed of a litany of deceptions, evasions, a jargon of cynical double meanings for different occasions.

But with the best will in the world toward true world peace, can any rational mind look for this peace from any organization composed of politicians and militarists—all puppets in the hands of the international bankers? There are many intelligent pacifists, both men and women, in all the countries. In India there was a Gandhi. Why were not these people called to serve any United Nations' project? Instead of that, we see this "peace" organization dominated by the Big Four, aggressive nations all, and even planning a world police force to carry out their dicta. Can those people ever come to peace? One is reminded of Bernard Shaw's remark in *Caesar and Cleopatra*:

"And so, to the end of history, murder shall breed murder, always in the name of right, honor and peace, until the gods tire of bloodshed and create a race that can understand."

The "Frisco fiasco" was derived from the most abysmal and groveling ignorance of history as well as a grave and studied misrepresentation of current world realities. To assume that our erstwhile enemies are war-minded and our fair weather allies are peace-loving is to ignore the obvious fact that two allies have been guilty of "treacheries" and "sneak attacks" in recent times.

The San Francisco Charter instead of eliminating war possibilities and establishing peace merely lays down rules for rivalry between the contending powers. At the very time they talked of peace, Russia was giving military training to 15-year-olds while the United States was trying to put over one year of compulsory military training and the largest army and navy in the history of the country. Britain, the first-rate exploiter and fifth-rate military power the big banks are pledging America to uphold and defend, is now nothing more than an island outpost off the coast of a Russian Europe. The buffer nation against Russia in the West (Germany) and the buffer against Russia in the East (Japan) are now eliminated; so it is to be expected that unless Russia comes across the big banks will soon rebuild Germany and Japan to powerful military powers. A mere sentence or two in a charter even far more respectable than that of UN will mean nothing in the way of an effective deterrent.

America pays the bill for UN operation—50 % of the administrative costs and virtually all of the World Bank's funds which finance the organization. People have shouted at the author, "Peace is cheap at any Price!" Even granting that this stupid set-up could under any set of circumstances bring peace, why do not other nations make the sacrifice of token payment? Since when has peace become a bargain only for the United States? Are bribed friends ever true ones? If Uncle Sam has to buy the machinery of peace why can't he operate it? There should be nothing illogical in his running to suit himself something he

bought and paid for. Uncle Sam is asked to pay all this because he is the richest in the world. His per capita debt is the largest in the world. Only in a bankers logic, or lack of it, could a man the furthest in debt be called the richest! What a farce!

In UN an elaborate system of pressure, discriminations, and boycotts is provided by the charter to enforce international trade collectivist upon member nations. World trade organizations are expected to enforce an international planned economy which means simply that U.S. trade will be under the direction of One World Supertasters. They yell "America must co-operate." Co-operate with anyone about anything even if it means co-operating the taxpayers' pockets inside out and the constitution upside down!

It is a temptation to take the UN charter and the Bretton Woods agreement part by part and expose their sinister plots, but obviously our space is too limited. The purpose here is to expose the financial interests behind them and the reasons for their actions. The words of real American nationalists are heavily drawn upon for this purpose, not only to show that this danger is more than one man's opinion, but also to teach the principle of patriotic Americans who find their teachings either misrepresented or met with a conspiracy of silence.

This over-head Utopia, according to Hearst's characterization:

"Began with a death, not a birth certificate, at San Francisco. It was the child of vain imaginings, of war time hypocrisies, of unrealistic vaporings of the mind, of brutal designs, of transparent bad faith, and of conflicts which even the blind mind could have understood if willing to accept self-evident facts.

It is time to remove the body. Public health requires a proper disposal of the remains before the precarious condition of the world becomes worse for the quarrels over the body. The enraptured have had their rhapsodies and are now silent. The one world has dissolved into its component parts of intrigue, force, greed, and conflict."

That the UN is a complete failure as far as its ostensible purpose of a World Supergovernment is concerned, does not mean it is not dangerous. The bankers are not completely satisfied with this turn of events but are still able to use it to good advantage as a clearing house for the real institution of control—the World Bank. That UN has failed to promote friendly relations among nations but has instead created ill will and benefited only potential aggressors, means nothing to them.

...Representative William Lemke of North Dakota said on the floor of the House of Representatives:

"It is the first time in the history of our Nation that we have put our stamp of approval upon liquidation and theft by three of the bigger nations of the

smaller nation's people and territory. We had better let some other nation pass judgment upon us rather than to rest secure by the ignorant, self-laudation, and admiration that we hear from time to time by those who think more of the ideologies of foreign nations than of our own.

America, watch your step! There are things going on here in Washington that are not healthy for democracy. This bill (UN) is one of them.... We are allowing our form of government to slip away from us.

We have been deceived in the past and we are being deceived now. We were told that Bretton Woods would satisfy these "50 peace-loving nations," that it was the road to eternal peace. Then we were told that UNRRA was our salvation, that by acting as Santa Claus for a select few nations was the road to permanent peace.

Then we were told the reciprocal trade agreement was sure enough the road to heaven, eternal joy and peace forever. Finally it was drummed in to us that UNO was the dove of peace with pure white wings, the only way to outlaw war.

Now the advocates of these things tell us that we must have a larger Army and a larger Navy than the combined armies and navies of the world....

We are told that we must have peace-time draft, to prevent Germany, Italy and Japan from again disturbing the peace. I challenge not only the correctness of that statement but its sincerity.... "History teaches us that this world never has been or can be ruled by fear—by one nation overawing all other nations. It teaches us that 'One world' lunacy never succeeded and never will succeed. Even if temporarily successful, it always falls to pieces because of its own corruption.

To live in peace, not in fear, must be the future aim of the family of nations. Caesar, Alexander the Great, Charlemagne, and Napoleon all died of the same disease 'one world' lunacy. Hitler's and Mussolini's ambitions hit upon the same rock."

Writing from San Francisco during the [United Nations] conference John O'Donnell wrote in a New York Daily News:

"Nothing ever was staged in this generation on such a scale of mass hypocrisy and global double-cross. Never, even at the Peace Conference of World War I or the sessions of the so-called world leaders during the

'20's, was a meeting of international political leaders staged against such a background of confusion, suspicion and cynicism as exists right here in this city at the present time.

If you don't believe it you should have heard the lusty belly laugh that went up from the reporters representing the so-called United Nations when they read a piece by one of the professed world-savers who passionately proclaimed in print that this San Francisco conference is "not only the greatest international meeting ever held on U.S. soil, it is the most important human gathering since the Last Supper....

The foreign boys are not going to shoot Santa Claus here in San Francisco, but they intend to take a peek in the bag and guess how much more is coming.

The cruel and bitter fact about this disorganized political circus being staged by big shots who no longer represent the citizens of their respective nations is that the publicity buildup for what is essentially a sordid bit of political trafficking and the paying off of secret contracts presents this conference of debtors to the U.S. Treasury and the nation's blood bank in a religious and spiritual setting, with much public beating of the breast and vowing of the peace to come in the best revivalist tradition of the late Billy Sunday and Aimee McPherson."

The American Indians missed out by not attending and getting in on the cut by demanding back at least forty-six states. In the international Babel at San Francisco twenty-two different languages were spoken, but the confusion of tongues was greatly lessened because "lend-lease," "reparations," "loans," and the like are all translated by the simple directive "gimme," which was the only word forty-five of the countries was interested in.

Examples of hypocrisy, suspicion and arrogance were many on the part of the leading nations, but Russia was by far the worst offender. Although only twenty of the forty-six nations gave plenipotentiary power to their delegates, the Russians went so far as to have their own private ships in San Francisco harbor with private wires in secret codes which were urgently used before even the simplest commitment. Soviet OGPU, spies and secret service were constantly on the alert. They made their demands as of right, practically as orders from Stalin to the conference. They bothered with neither argument or logic.

If the United Nations were more united there would undoubtedly have been more success at Lake Success. UN is instead a cuckoo land for "gimme Jimmies"; who make Peace a mere period of deceit, treachery, suspicion and conspiracy between two periods of armed conflict.

The United States will have peace only when it repudiates this one world hypnosis and returns to the Constitution on which the country was founded, especially Article I, section 8, paragraph 5 which would put international bankers in the banking business instead of misruling the world in the manner traced in this volume which shows, among other things, that the only thing the late European war settled for the United States is the fact that Germany can be beaten. But at \$300-billion a war, that might not be possible again.

At San Francisco nothing basic has been done to eliminate the cause of war by preventing depressions (monetary panics) with their unemployment and poverty. Just as despair will again drive idle men to crimes of violence, so will it lay hold of nations and again lead them to the crime of war. Nothing has been attempted which would establish the true foundation of peace by creating the necessary conditions in all nations for unfolding production and employment by means of a sensible democratic money system replacing the privately controlled money system now exploiting men and nations everywhere.

San Francisco thereby furnished the direct proof that those who concocted this war, because their financial interests were menaced, did so in order to eliminate the dangerous example which Germany had set by the reform of her money system, an example which, if permitted to have been continued in peace, would certainly have led to its adoption by other nations and to the destruction of the present financial enslavement of the world. This danger is now removed, perhaps for all time. But those who made World War II are identical with the agents of High Finance who secretly dominated the San Francisco Conference. Through the adoption of Bretton Woods the gold standard, challenged by Hitler, has been re-introduced in a veiled form for universal domination. The world is now being bent to its command.

Today the world participates in a hellish plot to make any liberation of a nation from financial enslavement impossible. The descendants of the men who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights now hold down their nation and other nations who are clamoring only for the right to live and become prosperous by work. Economic contraction and unemployment and poverty must be their lot while they are not permitted even to learn the origin of their chains. A wiser policy on the part of the United States would be to enforce Article I, section 8, paragraph 5 of the Constitution, and by the multiple benefits which would then be allowed to unfold establish by her example the right to propose the means of lasting world peace.

The half dozen blocks of New York City real estate recently donated by John D. Rockefeller as a permanent site for the home of UN is not nearly as generous on his part as it is supposed to be. The offer carries a provision that the sum be exempt from taxation. It may safely be assumed that Mr. Rockefeller falls into the highest income bracket and therefore pays by far the greater part of his taxable income to the government. What the United Nations received will therefore be almost wholly at the expense of the United States Treasury if the proposed legislation to exempt the price of this donation from taxation is adopted.

There can be no sense of justice in this arrangement unless it is just to burden the American people with far more than their proportionate share of the costs of maintaining the organization, without even giving them credit for doing so.

Acceptance of this gift does not add dignity nor demand respect on part of the organization, being composed as it is of fifty-seven nations including the largest and richest in the world. Granting this “tremendous” gift by Rockefeller demonstrates that United Nations is not altering world conditions to the detriment of the big financiers who, as has been seen, have been misruling the world so disastrously for everyone but themselves. With the firmer establishment of their domain in their creature (UN operated through the World Bank) it was well worth the comparatively insignificant sum of \$85-million – the value of the real estate given to UN.

The proposed headquarters will be but an \$85-million marble obituary tombstone for the already dead UN. A quonset hut would be permanent enough for its activities in the realms of chicanery, fraud and deceit. If it must have huge marble buildings, let it go to Geneva. That would put it across the ocean where, if anywhere, it belongs.

The United Nations secretariat has submitted a proposed international bill of rights to a drafting subcommittee of the human rights commission. Ironically enough, Russia sits on the commission of human rights. But this gives a clue as to what the finished product would be. Far from reinforcing the existing freedoms of Americans, the bill undermines them. This proposed Bill of Rights veers to the Left.

If the United Nations had any interest in securing to people anywhere the liberties which guarantee their private persons against the encroachments of tyranny, it would only have to take for its model the one great nation in the world where the sanctity of the individual has been confirmed by written guarantee which have lasted through every crisis for 158 years.

But the UN secretariat was not interested in effective means to safeguard Americans or anyone else in the rights which the American people have always known under the Republic. The obvious intention was to attempt to reconcile practices which make for a complete absence of freedom in numerous member states with rhetorical formulas which might seem to promise much without, in fact, granting the individual anything.

Thus, although the UN draft, as ably analyzed by the Chicago Tribune, restates the American concept that no one shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law, the assurance is tempered with the proviso that “*detention by purely executive order shall be unlawful except in time of national emergency*” – no restriction being placed on the right of the executive to declare such emergencies. One is reminded of article 48 of the Weimar constitution which proved the fatal weakness of the German republic. This enabled the executive to suspend constitutional processes at any time in favor of ruling by

decree. The article was invoked so often under the presidency of Field Marshal von Hindenburg as to make for the rise of Hitler.

In its statements of social purpose, the UN draft bill is even more vicious. It proclaims that *"every one owes a duty of loyalty to his state and the United Nations. He must accept his just share of responsibility for the performance of such social duties and his share of such common sacrifices as may contribute to the common good."* And again, that in the exercise of his rights *"everyone is limited by the rights of others and by the just requirements of the state and the United Nations."*

Honored by attacks from Washington and London the above mentioned Daily points out that it is obvious that any definition of what freedom is aiming at is a restriction on freedom. Freedom is either unalienable—a natural endowment of human beings—or it is nothing. It is less than nothing when it is reduced, as U.N. reduces it, to propagandistic statements of social intention, totalitarian in their inspiration.

Among the worst examples of this are declarations that everyone has *"the right and duty"* to perform socially useful work in return for the right *"to such equitable share of the national income as the need for his work and the increment it makes to the national welfare may justify."* This is Marxian dogma and nothing else and, as the fruits of the Marxian experiment in Soviet Russia show, it has not the least relationship to freedom.

If Americans hope to hold their ancient liberties under the Bill of Rights, they will have nothing to do with the bill of duties by which U.N. asserts the subjection of the citizen to the ends of the state. It is a franchise for tyranny, here and everywhere.

The United Nations in action could not be expected to be anything else but what it is in view of its conception, birth and up-bringing. Thus the recent Balkans investigation commission appointed by the United Nations fixed responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for creating disorders along the Greek border. The United States and seven other countries put the blame on these soviet satellites. Russia and its Polish puppet dissented. France refused to record an opinion.

As in all other activities of U.N., the communist camp was lined up against the non-communist. The report is another indication that the description united as applied to the nations composing the world organization is farcical. One worlders and goody-goodies who want to give America away are confronted with the disappointing evidence that U.N. cannot command any loyalty from the member states capable of rising above the narrowest national self-interest. Its decisions are in all instances political. Principle is an extraneous element.

Thus the conclusion of the Chicago Tribune seems to be a fair and solid judgment. Says the Tribune:

"Those who were most active in forming U.N. had three purposes in mind: 1, To affirm that the creation of U.N. provides moral justification for our having gone to war; 2, to create a world agency for the continuing oppression of the peoples of Asia and Africa by imperialists; 3, to establish a vehicle for depriving American citizens of rights they have under our Constitution through perversion of the treaty power or by asserting that U.N. dicta have binding effect on American citizens."

The internationalism fostered by international bankers must be replaced by Americanism fostered by Americans. America shall be on the way to peace when the following dream of Thomas Jefferson becomes realized:

"I hope (to see) a cordial fraternization among all the American nations, and . . . their coalescing in an American system of policy totally independent of and unconnected with that of Europe. The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian or partition through the ocean which separates the two Hemispheres, on the hither side of which no European gun shall ever be heard, nor an American on the other.... I hope no American patriot will ever lose sight of the essential policy of interdicting in the seas and territories of both Americas the ferocious and sanguinary contests of Europe."

...Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with Cis-Atlantic affairs."

This would necessitate the eradication of the power behind European and American powers–international banking. This is not isolationism. This is not reactionary. It is just a plain fundamental common sense patriotic principle of America First. It has much more to recommend it in leadership, theory and practice than does the lunacy of our present mud-
dlers who continue to sneeze when the International Bankers take snuff, and who in theory try to correct former mistakes by making still greater mistakes and who in practice place America last in everything nationally desirable!

In 1944 Reverend Arthur Terminello delivered an address in which he said:

"Shall victory consist in capturing and punishing Hitler? He deserves it. But even that is not worth one American life."

Shall victory mean teaching the Germans democracy? They tried it once and decided they did not want it. To teach them the lesson, are we going to stand over them for decades with a stick? Our victory will then consist in teaching them democracy by force. What a farce! What a farce when they–the liberat-

ed enemies—see the ruthless, soul-less, barbarian, communistic hordes ready to pounce upon them as soon as the teacher leaves the class-room!

We too have a stake in this war as well as those in comfortable offices in the Pentagon or the Treasury Buildings or the White House.... Should American soldiers go on dying because Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin cannot agree on what is to be done with foreign countries which do not belong to them?"

This speech was a prophesy. Not only are the barbarian hordes ready to pounce upon our fallen enemies as soon as our troops are withdrawn but the warmongers who forced us into that war are setting up a world government to destroy us as a nation. They are endeavoring to accomplish by treason within what Germany, Italy, and Japan failed to do by military aggression from without, thus proving that they are the worst enemies we have on the face of this earth. Not only that but they are the enemies of every other nation. World government is treason.

Now consider Bretton Woods with the World Bank and the World Fund. Although set up before UN they are treated last because they were by far the more important. Without them that clearing house of international finance, United Nations, would never have come into existence.

UN is to centralize political control while Bretton Woods is to centralize economic control—through finance, of course. Bretton Woods is the final consummation of gradual monetary encroachment which began with the establishment of the Bank of England centuries ago.

So long as the Bretton Woods agreement is permitted to function unhampered it does not matter in the practical functioning of the One Worlders scheme if the UN remains an innocuous debating society, especially if its activities, or lack of them, get the publicity.

The World Bank established at Bretton Woods is a Utopia born of One World ideology which reduces the people of the world to the status of serfs and slaves of an international monster which from its very nature is corrupt, oppressive and intolerant. It silently and secretly emerged from the Nation's most dishonored and immoral spot, Wall Street, the cancer at the heart of American Government.

The difference between the financial control before and after Bretton Woods is not one of kind, but of degree. It would have been as impossible to reform the corrupt money and banking system by going into partnership with Morgenthau and his international bankers as it would have been to reform hell by going into partnership with the devil and his henchmen.

Like U.N., the Bretton Woods issue was staged, and the agreements put across are a sad commentary on what propaganda can do to democracy. Bretton Woods advocates howled that they wanted co-operation and idiot-like yelled that all who opposed them did not want co-operation. Bretton Wooders have no monopoly on co-operation. They use the

same twist on the word “peace.” Making unsound loans without any adequate assurance that they will be used for productive purposes, taking foreign benefits at the expense of other peoples, do not promote peace. Yet all who oppose those loans were tagged as opponents of peace.

Concerning their lusty howl of “stabilization” Lewis Haney, Professor of Economics at NYU, says:

“There can be no stability in the relation between any two things which are themselves erratic and unstable. The only known way to stabilize exchange is to stabilize the currencies that are exchanged. This they do not propose. There is no sense in talking about stable exchange rates while leaving the currencies of the several nations unstable.”

Every representation concerning Bretton Woods was false, many of them deliberately so. It had nothing to do with its announced objectives but it had much to do with the unannounced objectives as outlined by Samuel Crowther writing in the Hearst Newspapers, as follows:

“These unannounced objectives are:

(1) To permit the present governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom to print money and get away with it until such time as other arrangements can be made, in exactly the same fashion as Hitler printed money and got away with it until other arrangements were made for him. Any government can print money, but it can stay in power only so long as the money will buy things.

(2) To put into the hands of the United States, the United Kingdom and Soviet Russia a strangle hold on the money of the world and therefore a strangle hold on the welfare of the peoples of the world.

Since any two of these partners can out vote the third, it could come about that the United States might be a candidate for strangulations. London and Moscow have, during the war, made a comprehensive treaty, only a part of which has been disclosed. This treaty will not be affected by anything that happens at San Francisco. They are full partners. We are trying to buy our way into the firm.

(3) To put into the hands of the Soviet government the sum of \$900 million. For this Stalin will put up a wad of paper money that he will print for the purpose and for which no one assumes a liability. That is, Stalin can borrow nearly a billion dollars without owing anybody for it. In another part of the

scheme. Russia can borrow an indefinite number of dollar probably running into the billions at a very low rate of interest on a simple promise to pay.

Of course this promise to pay cannot be enforced and equally of course Russia may repay in anything it chooses to call money."

The fact that exchange is international does not require a world authority to fix exchange rates, any more than a world authority is required to fix weights and measures. The yard and the meter, for example, are definite quantities everywhere, because there are standards for them that can be objectively ascertained.

Co-operation, peace, stabilization is feasible without any fund or bank. The place for America to start them is in America. By what authority are these ends going to be established for the world when each individual nation composing the group failed miserably to secure them in their own countries? The authority that seeks to override the failures and differences of nations can only be found in the unsavory activities of international finance. It had the accidental assistance of other sources, especially from Franklin D. Roosevelt who saw it as a worldwide "New Deal" which would absorb his American (sic!) counterpart with its prolonged depression and unemployment in spite of his spending sprees which reached astronomical proportions. Thus it is not surprising to find Roosevelt historically notorious as a cat's paw for those who think America should pay for the privilege of getting her pockets picked.

Bretton Woods has the same philosophical basis of cheating that is found dominating the Federal Reserve banks and the other branches of international banking. It is reliably related that the Federal Reserve had bills—World Bank bills—ready to circulate gradually by taking up U. S. currency by exchanging it. This process was to continue until all America's currency was World Bank money.

According to the Bretton Woods-Federal Reserve system all the standards of common honesty which men must follow in their daily intercourse do not apply to governments. A good example is given by Samuel Crowther. If a merchant buys goods and does not pay for them, he will end in bankruptcy and possibly in jail; but if a nation does this it can issue a decree making it illegal for citizens to pay their bills to foreigners and the default becomes "blocked exchange."

If a merchant draws checks without any money in the bank and, when the checks bounce, he offers a new issue of rubber checks, he will in most States go to jail; but when a government does this, it is called "going off the gold standard."

If a merchant sold orders for goods on himself and then doubled his prices when the orders were presented in order to give only half the goods the orders called for when issued, he would go to jail as a cheat; but when a government does this, it is said to have "devalued its currency."

Experts in this rot by which the world is run became monetary experts for the big event at Bretton Woods. The plan was drawn up and the only deliberations permitted were limited to ratifying the plans as written. This might be laughable if it did not place a levy which amounts to about \$230 on each American family, to say nothing of the putrid system it makes all the more fixed.

The Minority Report on the World Bank and the International Fund printed as a senate document of the Government printing office contains a bit of genuine Americanism. It is to be regretted that the names and methods of the people behind the scheme are not exposed. However, it reports five principle reasons for opposing the enactment are well worth repeating.

1. It involves the expenditure of \$5,925,000,000 of the taxpayers' money with negligible benefit to the people of the United States.

2. It entrusts \$5,925,000,000 of the money of American taxpayers to be disposed of by boards of directors on which we have only 1 director out of 12, and only from 27 to 35 percent of the voting power, although we deposit more than half of the real assets in the funds. The terms on which our money is to be lent are fixed by a board controlled by the very nations which wish to borrow that money.

3. These measures, added to the other policies endorsed by the Administration, embark the United States on a vast program of lending money abroad and guaranteeing private investments abroad, which program is wasteful of our assets, will create a false and inflated export trade leading to depression, and is more likely to create ill will than good will toward the United States.

4. Purporting to solve the world's economic troubles, neither the fund nor the bank offers a solution for the present emergency difficulties of a single country during the transition period, nor can the fund accomplish any of its alleged purposes during the transition period.

5. The fund attempts to set up a world-wide monetary authority and a system of managed currencies. While there are so many loopholes that we doubt its effectiveness. it can impose serious limitations on our freedom of action in economic matters and force a regimented control of exchange."

Amplifying these reasons the report says:

"In effect it (the World Bank Plan) involves our Government and other governments in a guarantee of private loans and investments abroad. Our Government does not guarantee private investments in the United States, and

we believe it is dangerous and unwise to embark on a permanent policy which amounts to government guarantee of private investments abroad.

The bank may make direct loans, but that is not intended to be its principal business. The ordinary procedure will be as follows: A foreign nation- or foreign corporation seeking a loan will come to the bank and ask the bank to guarantee such a loan. If the loan is to be made to a private foreign institution such as a public-utility company or an automobile manufacturer, the government of that country will have to guarantee the loan also. When the guaranty is given, the country or its corporation may float that loan in any country where it wishes to borrow the money and the loan will carry the guaranty of the International Bank.

It is fairly obvious that most of the loans sought will be in the United States, and we will, therefore, see a large financing operation with billions of dollars of these guaranteed securities widely advertised to American investors. While the United States Government is only responsible up to \$3,175,000,000, the whole \$9,100,000,000 of potential loans could be sold in the United States. The impression certainly will prevail that the United States Government is largely back of all these investments. Should there be a general default by the governments such as occurred in 1932, our Government might be morally obligated to make good the whole amount.

It is quite true that the United States has the right to veto any loan to be floated in dollars in the United States. This veto, however, is not reserved to Congress, so that we are, in effect, being asked to authorize the executive department to approve the sale of guaranteed foreign securities in the United States up to the total amount of \$9,100,000,000.

In effect, therefore, the bank is a tremendous plan, under the guise of international co-operation, to lend our people's and our Government's money abroad.

It is said that the money of other governments will also be used and thereby reduce our burden.... But under present conditions the whole burden will fall on us.... Few currencies are of any value outside of the country of issue unless we make them good. Any international fund, therefore, is not really international. It looks to the United States for support, and for some years to come it is merely a camouflaged method of lending American money and that of a few other solvent nations."

Another important fact for Americans to consider is that under the articles of agreement of the bank, the dollars that are borrowed do not even have to be spent in the United States and we are prohibited from so requiring. A new plant, in India for instance, may borrow dollars, buy all its equipment in England, and thus, in effect, help England pay her blocked sterling balances. Most of the guaranteed loans will undoubtedly be floated in the United States because our people have the savings to invest. The bank thus becomes a device for draining our savings out of the United States for the benefit of the rest of the world.

No wonder the British delegate at Bretton Woods made the following statement:

"Collapse is inevitable: Relax and enjoy it!"

An example of how the scheme works for the advantage of a foreign money man at American expense is seen in the British policy of blocked sterling balances towards its spheres of influence. This sterling can only be used for purchases in England and cannot be exchanged for dollars. In fact, today Americans are unable to sell goods in India or Egypt, for example. The testimony shows that an American pump manufacturer who has sold for many years in India is unable to obtain an import license. Although we have been distributing dollars freely in India, the English have collected all these dollars and given the Indians blocked sterling in exchange. Now import licenses are refused, primarily because the British Government will not let the India citizens use their United States dollars.

Another urgency for Bretton Woods is found in the big moneyed power's interest in the Russian situation. Stalin does not care a snap for the "security" offered by Bretton Woods. He is making his own security by marching his ruthless hordes over three-fourths of Europe. As for dominance of the Big Three, that might be a nuisance for Stalin because he dominated all he wants and is not interested in democracy or social advancement. But getting a lot of American machinery and cash for nothing more than signing a few scraps of paper sends the internationalists into a frenzy.

Paul Mallon writing from Washington in the New York Daily Mirror says:

"It is nothing like a bank except that it will be a place for foreign nations to get money. It is really a credit guarantee institution.

Only one-fifth of its proposed loans for rehabilitation and development will be made directly by it. The other four-fifths will be guarantees of loans by private bankers.

As a matter of fact, the negotiators at Bretton did not want to call it a bank but could think of no other word. A bank, as you know, is a place where people deposit their money, which is taken by the banker and loaned to bring a

profit to the institution. Any comparison of that formula to what was set up at Bretton is humorous if not ironical.

Certain general standards for the loans were fixed, but these were the easiest possible standards naturally. They were not the standards of banks for commercial loans."

The Duke of Bedford, one of England's leading monetary authorities says of Bretton Woods:

"It is a most impudent attempt by the worst type of Wall Street financiers to secure financial domination of the world.... The financiers who hatched this scheme suggested the establishment of a gang of their own representatives who would be above every government of the world, including our own."

Under the plot the [International Monetary] Fund and The [World] Bank alone have the power to terminate their own existence or to amend their constitutions. Should any international organization be set up to control world affairs, the only obligation imposed upon the bank and the fund is to "co-operate" with such organization, the terms of such organization being entirely at their own discretion. Any future World Authority will thus wait meekly, cap in hand, to learn the good pleasures of the Masters of the Purse. Such are the budding fruits of a war fought in the name of democracy, but in reality to make any repetition of the democratic German money experiment, there or elsewhere, impossible.

In these international constitutions national sovereign nations become mere doormats on which the money power will wipe its boots.

The World Bank plan stipulates that:

"The property and assets of the Fund wherever located and by whomever held, shall be immune from search, confiscation, expropriation or any other or legislative action."

The Fund's archives are inviolable. Its operations are to be "free from restrictions, regulation, control or moratoria of any nature". Immunities from interference are also bestowed upon its communications, and on its resident and travelling staffs.

The Fund, its assets, property, income, and its numerous operations and transactions are furthermore immune from taxation of any kind by any government. Similar immunities apply to the International Bank, except that it will allow itself to be sued under certain conditions it lays down.

This imposing list of immunities covers any eventuality quite effectively. No abrogation is tolerated even in time of war. The personnel of these institutions will have the privilege of passing freely from warring nations on one side to those on the other side. They can corre-

spond freely with the enemy without censorship, do business with him, advance him money, and ship him bullion or currency under safe conduct, just as international finance has always tried to do—too often with success, a success that is assured any. where in the world now.

From one end of the articles to the other there is not a word to be found limiting the power of the institution in time of war to do “business as usual” with both sides. They could even prescribe neutrality if such would happen to serve their purposes better. America has a minority vote in any combination, and once she stops being Santa Claus for the rest of the world at the expense of the tax paying public she will find her financial arrangements helpless in advance because of the commitments granted in the framework of this financial tyrant.

Bretton Woods gives International High Finance the green light to proceed with its planned domination of the world, to create economic conditions beneficial for the maintenance of the profit rate and not for the people. It is definitely the deliverance of the world to Mammon. It is self evident why not a word of this plot was made known to an anxious and interested nation.

“Freedom and Plenty,” the news organ of the Neo-Economy movement which, like money reform movements everywhere, protested against the tragedy of Bretton Woods gives its official and pointed view in part as follows:

“The representatives of international High Finance, assembled at Bretton Woods to provide the future of exploitation on an international and uniform scale, clothed their final draft of the experts’ plan of the new gold standard in such tangled, tricky, technical clauses that the victimized people of the world will never recognize that the dollar and the pound sterling are linked with gold and that the disastrous gold standard has, within the life of the present generation, been imposed on them the second time....

The complicated wording of the final Bretton Woods document will make it possible to convince the Members of Congress in U.S.A. that we actually got the gold standard back, and the Members of Parliament in England that they did not get the gold standard back....

Under the plan it will become impossible for this country or other countries to withdraw from the Fund and thus escape the consequences of our folly to have accepted the plan. Under Article XI the board of international financiers is given power to declare economic war on the United States should she devalue the dollar against the Board’s wishes. Further, all the United Nations will have to undertake to boycott this country in such an event.

To give the international bankers the control over the world, so that they can exploit the nations of the world systematically, is one of the most sinister plans ever hatched by our administration. It will not only mean loss of our economic and political sovereignty, not only involve economic contraction with mass poverty, but also new friction, and the necessity of fighting new wars, with the secret powers behind people's governments pulling the wires as desired by them."

A close look at the press will show that Wall Street has now been lengthened to run through Bretton Woods. No stranger union outside the odd bedfellows of politics has ever been seen. In the internationalists' propaganda Bretton Woods was the term used to designate the great financial scheme which would remake the postwar world into Utopia. New Deal publicists of all types were used to sell the scheme to the public. As part of their tactics, they smeared U.S. bankers.

Now the World Bank, as it is called, has started operations. Heading it are not New Dealers but a Wall Street lawyer and a Wall Street banker. Even the organization named to handle its public relations is of Wall Street.

Members of Congress regard Thomas W. Lamont, chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan and company, as the most powerful figure in New York financial circles. His position is being challenged somewhat by Winthrop Aldrich, head of the Chase National Bank, but the latter has far to go before he fills the Lamont shoes. It was Aldrich who proposed making an outright gift of the 3 3/4 billion dollar grant to Britain.

Morgan and company is considered the dominant voice in Wall Street. Other potent voices in addition to the Chase National Bank are such international bankers as Lazard Freres, Lehman Brothers, and Kuhn Loeb and Company.

In the early days of the New Deal, Wall streeters were reputedly on the outs with the administration. President Roosevelt had called for driving the money changers out of the temple. Nevertheless, J. P. Morgan himself was invited to the White House at least once for private consultation with the President. In 1937 when the New Deal was face to face with a business recession President Roosevelt began summoning business leaders quietly and even publicly to the White House. From the fall of 1937 Wall streeters were accustomed to having the door of the White House opened to them.

Lamont began as a White House visitor at that time. Owen D. Young and a host of leading business leaders paraded down Pennsylvania avenue to the nation's most famous address. At the same time British titles began appearing in increasing numbers on the calling list at the executive mansion.

At this time President Roosevelt shifted his attention from the domestic to the international scene. He was persuaded that domestic recovery could come through international stabilization instead of international stabilization through domestic recovery.

Within a year Wall streeters began crowding into the New Deal. Representatives of financial interests and their law firms began easing out planners of the new economy.

President Truman evidently gained many votes by charging that the Republican Party was controlled by Wall Street. His blast is true, but it is only half of the story. Wall Street also controls the Democratic Party with its synthetic liberals, foreign policy chameleons and America Last cultists which have positions of leadership in both parties. These leaders form the vanguard of State Socialism in America. The depression they will bring must be followed by an America First uprising that will stop the palming off of America's fortunes to foreign deadbeat nations, stop the playing of a shell game with America's economy, and establish in its place an American policy in finance and elsewhere if America is to have security—or even survival.

By 1940 Wall street, which had “opposed” Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, was working for the third term. Roosevelt and Wall street have been widely credited with formulating the strategy that won Wendell Willkie, a former Socialist and a former Democrat, the Republican nomination.

Willkie was known to Wall street as much of an interventionalist as the President was, even at the time the barefoot boy of Wall street was denouncing war in his campaign. At a dinner given by Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Reid of the internationalist New York Herald Tribune on June 4, 1940, Thomas Lamont was invited to look over two Republican Presidential possibilities—Willkie and Senator Taft. The guest of honor was the late Philip Kerr, British ambassador known in England as Lord Lothian.

Lewis Douglas, president of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, made a speech advocating United States entry into the war, according to a published account of the dinner. Taft differed with Douglas but Willkie indorsed his stand unqualifiedly. Three days later Willkie made an isolationist speech in Brooklyn, which ten months later he told a senate committee was merely “campaign oratory.” Within the month of the dinner Willkie, an unknown, had “captured” the Republican nomination.

Douglas had been with the New Deal as budget director. Subsequently he quit in protest against New Deal fiscal policies. He returned after Roosevelt and Wall street buried the hatchet. Recently he was named ambassador to England by President Truman, which appointment was regarded as evidence of Wall street influence on the latest occupant of the White House.

In 1944 Wall Street was preparing to help Roosevelt put over Willkie for the Republican candidate again so that the President would have another set-up campaign. Willkie's hopes were dashed by an ignominious defeat in the Wisconsin primary of that year. Wall

streeters then turned to Governor Dewey of New York whom they had wooed from nationalist to internationalist ranks. To keep Dewey in line with their one-world program, they reportedly had secured a commitment from him to name John Foster Dulles, partner in a leading Wall Street law firm, secretary of state.

In 1948 with a once-defeated Dewey definitely in their camp these interests openly supported "One World" Stassen, one of the earliest advocates of the junking of our own Constitution and Declaration of Independence in favor of "world government," while he was apparently popular. As his chances of victory waned they set up other stooges in strategic positions to assure themselves a suitable mouthpiece, not the least of whom was Michigan's vacillating, oscillating, titillating Senatorial jumping jack and political grasshopper, Arthur Vandenberg.

The McBride report published a bit of information as startling as it is enlightening when it reported:

"Anticipating a Republican victory in the 1948 Presidential election, Wall Street bankers of one-world persuasion are grooming several prominently mentioned men for the Republican nomination, one of whom they hope to nominate at Philadelphia. Two of these have endorsed reciprocal trade which is just another name for free trade, while others are exhibiting very decided one-world tendencies. Wall Street internationalists have been able to get away with this before, so it behooves the American people to be on guard, lest they lose when they think they are winning.

Most people on Capitol Hill know the above facts, but because a myth has been built up that no one can be nominated or elected President of the United States without the approval of Wall Street, many fear to say what they are thinking. Wall Street bankers of one-world persuasion are the most vulnerable group in the United States. They are the enemies of both labor and industry, but by keeping labor and industry divided, they have been able, with the help of Communists and fellow travelers, to dominate our domestic and foreign policy.

Real Americans, both employers and employees of the farm, mine, and factory, who believe in free competitive enterprise, sound money, and sound domestic economy, must unite against the common enemy. American public opinion, intelligently directed is more powerful than all the international banker-racketeers that ever lived."

After the outbreak of the war Wall streeters began to dominate the government in the open instead of behind the scenes. Various top positions were given to Wall streeters.

Many young Wall street lawyers and fiscal experts were introduced into less important, but nonetheless key posts.

Former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., is financing one of several syndicates and industrial corporations that wish to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Venezuela because of tax advantages. Stettinius, with the Bank of America, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and other banking companies, is backing the Lynch, Wilde Company of New York and Washington.

Stettinius, a Morgan partner, virtually turned over conduct of foreign affairs to New York fiscal interests and those who profit in foreign trade. His influence still holds in the department.

The former undersecretary of state for foreign affairs was William L. Clayton who, with his family, owns 40 percent of the stock of Anderson Clayton Company, largest cotton dealers in America. He has close ties with New York banks and Britain Secretary of State Acheson, corporation lawyer and newcomer to diplomacy, is a leader in formulation of the one-world program.

Dean Acheson, who as undersecretary of State has in many respects been the de-facto head of the department under both Secretaries Marshall and Byrnes, quit his job. He was to rejoin the law firm which is said to be handling at least one of the applications for international loans that he has been promoting in the state department. His successor is Robert A. Lovett.

Lovett's appointment will mean the addition of another Wall street representative to the high ranking officials of the Truman administration. The list includes Commerce Secretary Harriman, Navy Secretary Forrestal, War Secretary Patterson, William L. Clayton, one-time undersecretary of state for economic affairs; John Brown, assistant navy secretary; Howard Petersen, assistant war secretary, and Lewis Douglas, ambassador to Great Britain.

Robert A. Lovett, undersecretary of state, formerly a partner in the investment banking firm of Brown Brothers, Harriman and Co., says that America will have to dig into its pocket again in a hurry to keep Europe going. The Lovett plan for "emergency" aid is quite apart from the proposed Marshall plan which would siphon out the heavy cash on a long term basis.

The New Deal and the ranks of the state department in particular are not lacking in advocates of all sorts of schemes to bundle off America's billions abroad. One of the remarkable aspects of the situation is how much of this clamor is coming from men Wall street has planted in the administration.

Secretary of Commerce Harriman, for example, was a senior member of the same investment banking house as Lovett. Secretary of Defense Forrestal and Undersecretary of War Draper were, respectively president and vice president of another Wall street firm of

investment bankers, Dillon, Read and Co. Assistant Secretary of State Saltzman was vice president of the New York Stock exchange. More could be named.

Lovett's connections certainly do not commend him as trustworthy to commit the nation to further enormous diversions of the taxpayers' dollars for the benefit of Europe. He lives in the crowd that profits by these transactions, for Wall street not only has investments to protect abroad, but it has fat rake-offs, commissions, and profits to be had when these billions are spent in the American market.

Secretary of War Patterson was a Wall street lawyer before he went to the federal bench, from which he was brought into the sub-cabinet by Secretary Stimson, still another Wall street lawyer. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder ranks as one of the elite, certainly not because he is from St. Louis, but because he is an international banker. The only qualification necessary is that he belong to this fraternity: It then matters not whether he be from Padukah, the Kremlin, Mars, Antarctica, or Bali.

This is probably the greatest concentration of spokesmen for Wall street and its international high-binding that has ever been assembled in any American cabinet. It is particularly striking that this concentration should occur in an administration that started out 14 years ago with the announced watchword of driving the money changers out of the temple and so lately smear U.S. bankers of the internationalistic clan.

Secretary Forrestal could very easily have found many other highly eligible candidates for the post of general counsel of the navy department, but is consistent with his outlook that he should have awarded the job to a British born lawyer. In view of the fashionable disposition of Forrestal and his fellow Wall streeters to regard the United States as dedicated to the preservation of the empire, it probably seemed logical that if he could not install a full blown British in the job, he should settle for the next best thing.

The British have been lavish in bestowing their decorations and knightly orders upon American admirals. The same sort of flattery has been successful in dealing with army, and the state department these days is little more than a branch of the British foreign office. Representative Eaton, presiding over the house committee of foreign affairs, is a native Canadian, and Mr. Vandenberg, his opposite number in the Senate, is by conviction a devoted servant, even if denied the advantages of birth within the empire.

Senator Vandenberg, Money Power's favorite on, testified recently before the Senate Committee on the Greek loan. When asked why the loan was not handled by the World Bank he replied:

"It is definitely anticipated that the World Bank will step into this situation and carry the major rehabilitation load just as soon as the imminent crisis is

*surmounted; just as soon as peace and preliminary stability are restored;
just as soon as there is any basis whatever for banking credit."*

In other words, as soon as Greece is a good risk for private bankers! Until then the U.S. Government can have it and tax the public to pay for it!

Eastern banking interests are active participants in Bretton Woods because it offers a profitable field of international money lending. Under the program of the government's export-import bank, private commercial banks lend money to foreign borrowers but the loans are guaranteed by the export-import bank in that the commercial institutions are reimbursed for their loans in full upon demand.

Thus although the private banks may profit from the foreign loans, the federal government actually bears the obligation and risk. Extending Wall Street from Washington through Bretton Woods was an event of self-evident design and is so well established that only such stooges as Roosevelt and Truman would say as Truman did say in his last Jefferson-Jackson Day speech that: *"The Democratic Party has taken the Government from Wall Street and given it back to Washington."*

United States Ambassador Lewis Douglas said in a speech at a luncheon given in his honor in Denby, England, that the United States and Britain are *"in the same pot together. We have to remain in the same pot together—for if either of us falls out we fall into the fire together."*

Why are the United States and Britain in the fire together? Not because Britain is the source of our raw materials. Not because Britain is the source of our technical brains. Not because Britain has all the ships, trains, and airplanes. Not because Britain has any monopoly on scientific advancement. Not because Britain is the source of our food. Not because Britain has the Atom bomb while America hasn't. Certainly not because Britain loans America money on which to operate.

America and Britain are *"in the same pot together"* because international bankers find it to their profit to hang on to the Empire's sources of plunder, and this they will do even if America must be placed in the same grave with the now dead Empire. The revolt of the 13 colonies for independence, freedom and democracy has been successfully reversed. With the internationalists in charge the United States is to its own serious detriment back under the crown in all but the name of a colony.

So complete is the control of international finance in the post-war world ... that starving Germany is compelled to export biscuits to starving England which in turn is compelled by the usury lords to export biscuits all over the world. So everybody starves to keep King Export on the throne. All starving countries have a Ministry of Food to keep them hungry. The rule of Money Power, Planned Hunger and Ministers of Food are all parts of the same set-up. God has not failed. The world is bursting with

food. Hungry people cannot get at the food for two hellish reasons: first, the Money Power sees to it they are kept short on money; second, the producers are taxed, controlled, restricted, and regimented so the food cannot move but must rot.

Thus can be seen what is happening to European countries. It can be imagined who the angels are who are so kindly placing mortgages on those countries and issuing them paper on their own collateral. These people can hardly be expected to show their appreciation by erecting a monument to the kind international bankers who make them furnish the dough, bake the cake, and then pay the bankers in order to eat their own cake. Modern civilization has become a debt-culture in which the present generation pays the debts of a former generation by issuing bonds for the next generation to pay.

Until the principles of sound finance are established the World Enemy of International Finance will fatten as any leech which sucks the blood of others. It is therefore not surprising to find that the new president of Italy was president of the Bank of Italy who is "most friendly to the United States" and who thinks that U.S. gifts are "the key to recovery."

These national and international enemies with their UN-Bretton Woods philosophy have reached the ultimate in Secretary Marshall's perfidious Wall street scheme to internationalize America's wealth for the benefit of other "isms" at the expense and perhaps the death of Americanism. There will always be an America only if we can keep such floundering hirelings from giving her away. The world was told that the gift loan to Britain was to "put Britain back on her feet." It did not put Britain back on her feet and was not intended to put her back on her feet. The Marshall plan for the "recovery of Europe" will not bring recovery to Europe and is not intended to bring recovery to Europe no matter when the bleeding hearts, globalists and their shouting internationalists say. These schemes are for the exclusive profits of International potentates of purse and putrefaction. Our federal reserve printing presses are to furnish money for the world, our crops to feed it, our fleets to patrol it, our troops to get shoved around everywhere in it, and our statesmanship to play with it all under the expert direction of banker specialists in foreign med. cling.

The McBride Report printed for the use of the Committee of Coinage, Weights and Measures, of the House of Representatives, wisely observes:

"Every war since the wars of the Crusades has been, in essence, an economic war. Every major depression which has afflicted the United States and the world in the past seventy five years has been the inevitable result of an unsound world economy and an unsound monetary system. If we would end wars and depressions, we must first ascertain and then eliminate the causes.

Sound money and a sound world economy are absolutely essential to the survival of free enterprise and constitutional government."

The perfected set-up of international finance is the Number One Enemy of every reader of this book. Much will be accomplished if this book is instrumental in informing the people who and what their enemy is and what should be done about it. To know the enemy is the primary essential. The next is to know the remedy which is monetary reform based upon Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the Constitution of the United States of America. Americans owe to America in general, and to themselves in particular, to acquaint themselves with organizations advocating constitutional money. The forces against the imperative reformation are great, but the power of an aroused America is greater. Unless we reform money here and show all other nations how money should be reformed we shall have no peace on earth. Without monetary reform there is no use to talk of any other national or international, social, political or economic reform. The money problem is the basic problem of simple justice. It is the key to most economic problems, and the peace of World War II will be lost, as was the peace of World War I, without the establishment of this foundation for Justice, Peace and Freedom.

"Money is the mysterious power, the Goddess that gives birth to civilization but that also can destroy civilization.

The purification of money must be added to our expiation for the blood that has been spilled. It is not the heartless science of economics which requires this: It's truth, right and loyalty."